COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. X. No. 8.] LONDON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1806. [PRICE 10D.

"La puissance souveraine peut maltraiter un brave homme, mais non pas le déshonorer."—VOLTAIRE.
"An uncontroled Sovereign has the power to ill-treat a worthy man, but not to dishonour him."

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

Mr. COCHRANE JOHNSTONE.——This gentleman having in page 203 of this volume, published an Address to the public, upon the subject of the conduct of the Duke of York, subsequent to the transactions recorded in the present volume, page 1 to 20, a new stir has taken place in the regions of the Horse-Guards, and COLONEL GORDON, the Secretary of the Duke of York, has, with much pomposity, come forward with a denial of ever having *seen* Mr. M'ARTHUR in his whole life time!——The reader will perceive, by recurring to Mr. JOHNSTONE's address, in page 203, that this MR. M'ARTHUR was introduced as a person who had heard Colonel Gordon say something that corroborated the statement of LORD MOIRA, relative to the Duke of York's promise to recommend to his Majesty to do Mr. JOHNSTONE justice; and, it would seem, from another address of Mr. JOHNSTONE to the public, which will be found in a subsequent page, that Mr. M'ARTHUR has mistaken *another* Colonel Gordon for the Duke of York's Colonel Gordon; for that Colonel, who has, ever since he has been called a colonel, been employed as a clerk, and who, as to the useful capacity of writing much and saying little, has, it is universally allowed, carried off the palm even from Mr. HUSKISSON himself.——This gentleman, who, for some reason or other, seems not to be over-anxious to be thought acquainted with Mr. M'ARTHUR, has, at the same time that he denies ever having *seen* that gentleman, denied that he ever made use of the words attributed to him by Mr. M'ARTHUR; and, indeed, it is of little consequence whether he ever did utter such words. For my part, I always was of opinion, that Mr, JOHNSTONE's introducing of Mr. M'ARTHUR and his dinner anecdote, which now appears to have been a blunder, was quite unnecessary. Mr. Johnstone appears to have thought it useful as a *corroboration* of the statement of LORD MOIRA; but, that statement, backed by circumstantial proof as it abundantly was, wanted no corroboration at all.——It would, however, appear, that LORD MOIRA himself wishes to retract some part of the statement attributed to him by Mr. JOHNSTONE; for, as the reader will perceive by his letter to me, which is inserted in a subsequent page of this sheet, his lordship complains of errors and mistakes in Mr. JOHNSTONE's address, which was published in the Register before-mentioned. His lordship does, indeed, call upon me to correct these errors; but, after reading his letter over and over again, I have not been able to determine *what* mistakes these are, which he wishes to have cleared up. I have, therefore, inserted his lordship's own description of them, subjoining thereunto my letter in answer to that of his lordship; and, these letters together with Mr. JOHNSTONE's remarks upon the letter of Colonel Gordon, will put the public in possession of the present state of the controversy, it being only necessary to add, that COLONEL JOHNSTONE's address reached me the day after I received the letter of LORD MOIRA, and that this letter of Lord Moira to me is the *communication*, to which Mr. JOHNSTONE evidently alludes at the out-set of his address, whence it would appear, that LORD MOIRA had intimated to him his intention of making such a communication to the public. ——In the next Number of the Register, the reader may, I trust, expect to see Mr. JOHNSTONE's answer to LORD MOIRA's public letter. Then we shall, probably, learn *what it is that his lordship means to deny*; but, at present, it is impossible for me, at least, to discover his meaning.——It will be observed, that the original ground of Mr. JOHNSTONE's complaint remains untouched; that *cause*, which LORD MOIRA espoused, remains just what it always was; the injury remains, and redress has not been afforded. The present ministers, and particularly Mr. FOX, LORD MOIRA, and General FITZPATRICK, stood pledged to Mr. JOHNSTONE to procure him redress, if possible, while they were *out* of power. Being in power, he had a right to demand it of them. He did demand it, and they, for the reasons which have appeared, and which will appear, gave up his cause ——The whole of the army expected to see justice done him

The whole nation expected it; and, therefore, when there no longer appeared any hopes of seeing this expectation realized, it became necessary for him to state to the world the circumstances attending the final rejection of his claims. In doing this he had to relate what was told him by LORD MOIRA respecting a promise of the Duke of York, and he had also to lay before the public a letter from the Duke of York's Secretary, *flatly contradicting the assertion of Lord Moira.* It was not only justifiable, but it was an act of duty, in Mr. JOHNSTONE, to communicate these things to the public. The manner, in which his cause had been defeated, was, indeed, a trifling subject compared to that of the cause itself; but, still it was of importance, because it shewed, in a very strong light, the sort of influence that had prevailed, and that still did prevail, in the state as well as in the army. It shewed, that these mighty ministers, who, only last year, were making motions for a *Council of War* to assist the Duke of York, were, the moment they came to taste the honey of office, as submissive to him as any of their predecessors had been. It shewed, that the fulsome, the disgusting, flattery of "the *illustrious* person at the head of the army," from the lips of General Fitzpatrick, and (oh, inexpressible mortification!) from those of *Mr Windham*, was no more than fairly indicative of the actions they were ready to perform at his nod. And, as to Mr. JOHNSTONE himself, it showed, that, the ministers as well as the public were convinced of the justice of his cau e; but that, the same power that had prevailed before, still prevailed against him.——But, let not Lord Moira, or any other of the parties, suppose, that, by creating a controversy about trifling mistakes as to the inferior circumstances; let them not imagine, that, by means like these, they will put out of sight the fact, that they, after having, upon a full knowledge of all the circumstances, espoused the cause of Mr. JOHNSTONE, as being a just cause, and a public cause, gave up that cause, and that, too, without being able to assign, for so doing, any other reason than a desire to promote their own private interests and convenience. Let them not imagine, that they will put this fact out of sight. Let them not imagine, that Mr. JOHNSTONE will EVER desist from his pursuit, until he has obtained justice. Let them not imagine, let them not flatter themselves with the hope, that they have the power to dishonour him, or to reduce him to silence. Let them not rely, with too much confidence, upon the chapter of accidents; that chapter is as good for him as for them: he may live longer than they; and, I cannot for my part conceive a more laudable object of life, than that of obtaining justice for injuries and insults received. Were I in the place of Mr. JOHNSTONE, nothing upon earth should *now* induce me to accept, from the same hands, of what I had before asked for. I would make my arrangements for *a life* devoted to the securing of others from similar injuries. I would leave to such men as LORD MOIRA the gratification of hearing "*the Duke of York* call for the dance of "*Lady Flora Elizabeth Hastings*, a dance "composed in compliment to the *infant* "daughter of the Countess of Loudon and "Moira," to such men I would leave such gratifications, while I would steadily pursue the great object, which, whether I attained it or not, would be *something* wherewith to connect a man's name. The public papers have stated, that Mr. JOHNSTONE has offered himself for HONITON, in opposition to the sinecure-placeman, BRADSHAW (Lord COCHRANE being sure of his election); and, if this be the case, and he should be returned to parliament, he will have an opportunity of prosecuting his great object with many advantages. *Majorities* may be found against him; but, majorities cannot prevent *discussion*; and, let the Duke of York think what he will, *discussion* is all that is wanted. In short, the cause of MR. JOHNSTONE is the cause of every good man; every good man is on his side; in order to obtain a complete triumph, he has nothing to do but to persevere with discretion and with cheerfulness; every day will bring forth circumstances to aid him; he has time and truth for him, and with such friends, he may safely defy all the foes that can rise up against him.——When MR. JOHNSTONE has replied to the letter of LORD MOIRA, I shall, if I see no reason to alter my present opinion as to the propriety of doing it, republish my statement of MR. JOHNSTONE'S case, as it will be found in page 1 to 20 of the present volume, adding thereunto the illustrations afforded in the case of Major Cameron and others, who have been *punished for having brought their superior officers to a court-martial without being able to establish the charges against them.* In fact, it being my decided opinion, that the source of the injuries received by Colonel Johnstone, is also the source of no small part of the evils under which the country is now labouring along like a half-foundered vessel, I am resolved to assist, with all the means in my power, in exposing the very

bottom of that source to the eyes of the public ——I cannot dismiss this article without begging the reader to reflect, that this is no *party*, no *personal* question; for, though it must be allowed, that MR. JOHNSTONE's cause derives some weight from his high reputation; though it must be allowed, that, if he had rendered himself famous for nothing but RUNNING AWAY and BRINGING INFAMY UPON THE ARMS OF ENGLAND, instead of having long and faithfully and gallantly served his country, in almost every part of the world; though it must be allowed, that, if he were at once half an ideot and yet master of the utmost degree of low cunning; if he were equally conspicuous for feminine weakness and for fiend-like cruelty, for pride and for meanness, for prodigality and for rapaciousness; if, while he had the command of soldiers, he had made a vile job of his trust, and had, through the means thereof, shamefully robbed the people, whom he was amply paid to defend; if, in short, he had (having previously bribed, or intimidated, every one, from whom he might apprehend exposure), given way to his numerous and conflicting vices, and had thereby rendered himself an object of universal, though *whispering*, execration; if MR. JOHNSTONE had been such a man, though it is preposterous to conceive that such an officer could ever have been placed and kept in command by our most gracious Sovereign; but, merely for illustration's sake, suppose MR. JOHNSTONE had been such a man, in that case, it must be allowed, that his cause would have suffered from the hatred which would have been entertained, and justly entertained, against himself; but, prejudice, even in such a case, would have been unjustifiable; and, in the present case, there has been no room at all for the operation of personal prejudice.——In like manner, *party* considerations have, at no time, appeared in the discussion. The cause, as was before said, is *the cause of the public*, the cause of *the whole nation*; and, as such, I hope, and I confidently trust, that it will, though we wait a year or two for the event, be crowned with success.

"DELICATE INVESTIGATION."—Upon this subject, there have already appeared three articles in the Political Register; at page 973 of Vol. IX. and at pages 49 and 170 of the present Volume.——The reader will bear in mind, that I have all along stated, that I meant to express *no opinion* whatever upon the merits of the case, upon the great question, *whether the lady was guilty of the frailties said to have been laid to her charge*; and, that the only reason for my meddling with the subject at all, was to prevent, as far as I might be able, a public prejudice being imbibed against the persons, who were said to have given evidence in the case, and whom, merely for their having become witnesses, or, perhaps, *informers*, a writer in the Morning Post represented as deserving *to die*. It was for the purpose of combating this most shocking slave; it was for the purpose of preventing his vile notions, notions that would have disgraced a Russian, from gaining ground amongst the thoughtless crowds of the metropolis, and thence working their way into the country; this was the purpose for which my remarks upon the "Delicate Investigation" were made, and not for the purpose of giving, by way of insinuation, an opinion hostile to the party said to have been accused. But, I must confess, that, as I proceeded in my observations upon what was passing, an interest grew up in my mind, as to what was really the fact with regard to the conduct of the lady in question; and, I was not at all pleased to perceive, that, towards the time of closing the examination before the Secret Committee, the writer in the Morning Post became less and less confident in his assertions respecting the innocence of the lady, less and less severe towards her accusers, less and less inclined to plead her cause upon the ground of law and justice, and more and more inclined to rely upon the good-nature, the compassion, the forgiving disposition of JOHN BULL. Then, the *Report*, which was to have made its appearance on a certain day, was kept back. It was next to impossible to discover any very *satisfactory* reason for this. At last, however, the report is *made*; but, not *published*. The *reasons* for this we will inquire into presently, when we have heard the MORNING POST, for, probably, the last time. But, before the reader enters upon this article, I beseech him to recollect that this print *has*, over and over again, asserted, *that* the conduct of the lady had been such, that the very breath of calumny had never, until the hour of the wicked combination, been heard against her; that her conduct not only proved her virtue to be unsullied, but that it could not, without a crime on the part of the person suspecting, "be suspected *as* POSSIBLE *to be sullied*;" that she was "in *appearances* as well as in "reality, all virtue;" that she was "a "pattern to her sex;" that "the country "thought itself happy in the prospect of "having a queen as peerless in virtue as in "external accomplishments." Now, observe, I do not say, that any part of this was

false. I never said it was false. I only said that the writer in the MORNING POST did not prove it to be true; and, indeed, that he wrote just as I should have supposed he would have written, if he had known it not to be true. But, I never said, and I do not now say, that it is false. I still refrain from giving any opinion at all upon the merits of the case; though it must be evident, that, if we were permitted to judge from the altered tone of the MORNING POST, there would not need much hesitation in forming an opinion pretty decided.——"We are happy," says that print of the 16th instant, "We are "*happy*" (happy, observe) "to announce, "that the much wished-for report has been "at length delivered to the much injured "illustrious lady, whose situation has ex- "cited the interest, and engaged the sym- "pathy, of every generous and every ho- "nest bosom in the British Empire. We "understand the report bears date the 14th "July, though it was delivered to the illus- "trious lady only on the 11th of August. It "contains a general and absolute acquittal "from every thing *criminal*; but, it is said, "at the same time, to notice *some trifling* "*levities*. The whole of the proceedings "have been grounded upon the depositions "of a certain gentleman and his lady, and "of some menial servants *who formerly be- "longed to Carlton House*. The evidence, "or at least the material part of it, is sub- "joined to the report, and the whole is ex- "pected to be given to the public. The "nature and amount of the original "charges the public is already acquainted "with. The first was nothing less than "that the illustrious Lady had *given birth* "*to a spurious male child*. The second al- "leged a *general impropriety of conduct*. "The first has been proved absolutely and "totally false; and the second, upon the "strictest investigation of the most severe "moralists, dwindles into some *trifling and* "*harmless levities*, from which NO WO- "MAN IN THE LAND IS FREE. Who "that is even living in the house of her "husband, surrounded with her family, "cheered and engaged, and admonished by "objects, in which the attractions of love, "and the obligations of duty are combined "—who, even in that situation, *can pretend* "*to be wholly free from trifling levities*, which "wicked malice can exaggerate into matter "of scandal, but which ought to be passed "over in silence when that scandal has been "proved to be groundless? Without a "husband to support, without a child to "comfort, without a *mother* to advise, sur- "rounded with the worst of sycophants, "those who are prepared to seduce for the "purpose of betraying, what but *the most* "*unexampled purity* could have preserved "a conduct, the whole series of which, for "above ten years, on the strictest investi- "tion, affords our most rigid moralists no "ground whatsoever of censure, and no- "thing to notice in the way of admonition "but *a few trifling levities?* Which of the "commissioners, *which of their wives can* "*say so much for themselves*, though they, "and certainly their wives, are proofs of "the highest purity and honour? We "have said the charges exhibited against "the illustrious Princess were infamous ca- "lumnies. Our character of them has "been fully established by the report, the "substance of which we have stated. It "is not for us to designate, or to punish the "authors of a calumny so foul and so de- "testable. *The illustrious husband* of the "injured lady will, no doubt, *feel himself* "*bound to avenge the insulted purity*, which "he was so anxious to see established by "an investigation calculated to discover the "slightest stain. The commissioners, also, "must feel it their duty to punish the tra- "ducers of the unsullied fame of the second "lady in the land, otherwise their investi- "gation will have done nothing more than "to put innocence upon the ordeal, and "have suffered treason and calumny to es- "cape unpunished. The British people will "expect for the consort of the heir apparent "of the throne a redress which the wife of "the meanest tradesman would not fail to "attain by law, if equally innocent and "equally calumniated. Surely *that sove- "reign* who has ever proved himself an "equally benignant father to every branch "of his family, and to his people, *will not* "*suffer* the justice due to one of the most "interesting individuals of that family, and "to the whole of that people, to remain "unsatisfied in so material an instance "as the prosecution and the punishment "of the foul defamers of our illustrious "and interesting Princess! It is not "for us to point out particularly who "are the calumniators and defamers. They "must be known to the exalted per- "sons and personages we have alluded to in "the last sentences. They will probably "be known to every one on the publication "of the report. Rumour has already de- "signated some persons, a rumour origi- "nating in the highest, and therefore it is "to be presumed, in a matter of this na- "ture in particular, the best informed cir- "cles. In such cases, and such circum- "stances, rumour seldom errs. We, how-

"ever, say nothing more, than that such "enormous charges against so exalted a "personage being proved to be totally ground-"less, are infamous calumnies; that the au-"thors of such charges are infamous calum-"niators, and ought to be punished with "the most rigourous and exemplary justice. "We have further only to notice a circum-"stance in the manner of delivering the re-"port to the Princess, which, though but "a point of etiquette, will yet be regarded "as not unworthy of remark. The report, "we are informed, was conveyed to the "Princess by one of the Lord Chancellor's "*footmen*. It will probably turn out that "his lordship in person presented it to the "Prince at Brighton on the following day. "The public will, we are sure, think with "us, that this distinction was not respect-"ful, nay more, that it was not decent. "The Lord Chancellor himself ought in "propriety to have waited on the princess, "and in doing so, he certainly would not "have derogated from his dignity."—— Well, it might, or it might not, be proper to deliver to the Princess the report by the hands of a *footman*; but, at any rate, if we are to believe this writer, the Princess *has* the report. Now, therefore, we shall, I hope, hear no more complaints, on his part, that the report is *withheld from the public!* In his former articles upon the subject, he called for the report; he dared certain of the parties to publish it; he threw out insinuations that they withheld it, because it would discover who were *the instigators*, which instigators, and particularly the principal one, was pretty clearly designated. To withhold the report from the public was, in short, represented as a most detestable act of injustice towards the party accused; and it should never be forgotten, that, in order to impress this notion the more strongly upon the mind of the public, it was distinctly asserted in the MORNING POST, that the "lovely and "much-injured illustrious lady had written "to His Majesty, requesting, in the most "pressing terms, *that the report might be* "*published*." Now, then, if we are to believe the MORNING POST, she has the report in her own power; and, may we not be permitted to ask, *the reason* why she does not cause it to be published? For my part, I do not pretend to say, that she has the report. I know nothing about the matter. Every word that the MORNING POST has told us about the delivery of the report and about the other circumstances may, for aught I know, be false; but, if what this writer now tells us *be true*, and if what he told us before *was true*, does it not behove him to explain to us *why* the "much-injured "lady" does not cause to take place that publication, to procure which she before was so anxious?——I repeat, that I wish to be considered as commenting upon a mere paragraph in the MORNING POST; upon sentences that have proceeded from the imagination, perhaps, of the writer; and not upon a statement of real facts. All the facts that he has stated may be false. I hope that some of them are so; but *if they were true*, then should I say, that, if I were in his place, I would lose no time in following the example of Achitophel; for how, under such circumstances, a writer can ever again have the effrontery to present himself before the public, is, to me, utterly inconceivable.——We are told, that the depositions have, in part, proceeded from "menial "servants, *who formerly belonged to Carle-*"*ton House*," the insinuation conveyed in which observation no one will be at a loss to understand. But, *how* did these menial servants *formerly* belong to Carleton House? They belonged to it, doubtless, while it was the habitation of their mistress, with whom they left it, with whom it is more than probable, they entered it; and, I appeal to the reader, whether this be a description of witnesses, with regard to whom the above insinuation can be just. When, too, we ask a man what has been the result of an inquiry into his conduct, we do not like to hear him *begin* his answer by impeaching the character of the witnesses. These menial servants, if they formerly belonged to Carleton House, came, in all likelihood, from Germany with the Princess; or, at any rate, they must have come from Carleton House with their mistress and in consequence of her own free choice; for, as to her having, since that time, received servants from Carleton House, no one in the kingdom will believe it. The attempt, therefore, to invalidate the testimony of these servants, and that, too, by the means of an insinuation of their having acted under an influence from Carleton House, is extremely foolish as well as wicked; because, to every one who takes time to reflect, it must be evident, that a good cause scorns all such attempts.——But, the part of this statement which has given the greatest offence, is, that, wherein the writer characterizes the conduct of the Princess of Wales, and apologizes for it upon the ground of its being *common amongst other women*. It does, he tells us, appear, that the whole of the proof against the Princess amounts to nothing more than "some *trifling levities*;" and he adds, that, from such levities, "NO WO-

"MAN IN THE LAND IS FREE." It is a pity, that, as he was able to inform us of the exact time and the precise manner of the delivery of the report to the Princess, he was not also able to tell us, with equal exactness, *what sort* of levities those were, to which he was alluding. Did he mean to say, that the Secret Committee had called the levities "*trifling?*" Did he mean to say, that *they* had observed, that from such levities, "*no woman in the land was free?*" Or, was the former an epithet prefixed, and the latter an observation added, by himself? Why are we left in this state of uncertainty, when, from the same source that this writer drew his information (upon the supposition that it is authentic), he might have furnished us with the report itself? Why are the means of judging correctly kept from us? Or, at least, why are we to be daily told of "infamous calumnies," which some of our fellow subjects have been guilty of, while the *proof* of those calumnies is studiously kept from us? Why are we plyed, before hand, with extenuating descriptions of the conduct of the party accused? Why not give us the evidence at once, and trust to us to form a judgement as to the acts, of which it contains an account? ——Without this evidence to assail us, however, we are called upon to make a remark or two upon the observation, that "*no woman* in the land is free from trifling "*levities*;' and, particularly, that the wives of the members of the Secret Committee, that is to say, Ladies SPENCER and GRENVILLE, *cannot say for themselves*, that they have never, since their marriage, been guilty of any thing more than "*a few trifling levities.*" This is very much like brazening the thing out. The writer does not, indeed, tell us what acts he means to comprehend under the name of levities. We cannot, therefore, say, that he does not consider talking love to a parrot, kissing a lap dog, or hugging a monkey; we cannot say, that he does not consider these, and the like of them, as levities, in which case his appeal to the example of the women of this country in general would have no truth in it, though it would, nevertheless, contain nothing mischievous. But, if, by "levities," he means any thing approaching to acts of gross familiarity with *men* and, if he means to say, that "*no woman in the land is free*" *from such acts*; then are the husbands and the wives in this country, if they treat not the remark with indignation, well worthy of the contempt of the world. All along I am speaking of sentiments expressed and facts stated in the MORNING POST; I am far from inferring, that the Princess of Wales has been even charged with "levities;" but this I say, that, if the women of England were willing to have "levities" imputed to them, were willing to confess themselves to be *light* women, in order thereby to furnish a justification for any Princess or Queen in the world; if the women of England were willing thus to be blasted in reputation, and especially from such a motive, all that I can say, is, that they would make most excellent breeders of slaves. It is the common defence of offenders of every sort, that, they have done no more than has been done by others. "I am not *the first*, and I shall not be *the last*," is the self-consoling remark of every girl, whose "levities," in the long run, compel her to appear before a justice of the peace. Nay, I am far from saying or insinuating, that any such levities or any levities at all, have been imputed, or are imputable, to the Princess of Wales. I am merely commenting upon an article in the MORNING POST; but, is not this defence, or, perhaps; affected defence, set up by that print, calculated to do infinite mischief to her Royal Highness? Is it not, in fact, the last resort of all those, who are totally dessitute of all grounds of defence for their conduct? Still, however, this writer goes further. He is not content with observing, that the frailty of which he is speaking is not confined to the particular person in question; but, he asserts, that *every other woman in the land* has, at some time, or other, fallen into similar frailty! This is, indeed, an "*infamous calumny*," and, if it be not severely punished by the effect of public indignation, there must be in the public of the metropolis even less virtue than I am disposed to attribute to them.——Apparently conscious, however, that mere recrimination would not go very far in the way of *justifying*, this writer reminds us of the *unprotected*, the *helpless*, situation of the Princess of Wales; and, he seems to infer, that that situation forms a tolerably good ground of excuse for "trifling levities." But, if the situation has been what he describes it, ought it not rather to have produced an effect precisely the contrary of that which he seems to think it calculated to produce? What *support*, what *comfort*, has the Princess of Wales wanted? *How long* is it since her child ceased to reside under the same roof with her? How few married women, comparatively speaking, have a mother to advise with? What need is there of *advice* with respect to *a matter like that of which we are speaking*? And, if advice

had been wanted, was there not her Majesty, the Queen, to give it? "No mother," it is true; but a mother-in-law and an aunt, in the same person, and a most loving father-in-law, having ample means to give effect to his affection. What ground of complaint is there, then, upon the score of being left destitute of friends and relations? In short, all these attempts to defend or excuse "trifling levities," are so many assaults upon the morals of the nation. The writer is a defender of vice; an open propagator of the principles of immorality; and, he would, in my opinion, be a much fitter object of the vengeance of the VICE SOCIETY, than are the poor creatures, who vend gingerbread and apples on a Sunday, only because necessity compels them to work all the rest of the week. But, here, I suppose, these conscientious gentlemen would find, for their forbearance, reasons similar to those that restrain them from meddling with the gaming-houses in St. James's Street, while they hunt out every nine-pin alley within the sound of Bow-bell. Nay, it is among the puritans (who are at bottom much more nearly related to the prostitutes than people in general imagine), that the doctrine of the MORNING POST is the most prevalent. It is truly diverting to observe how they conjure up excuses upon this occasion; how they evade every fact and every argument that you produce; how they fly from every point, to which you endeavour to hold them; and how, at last, when evasion will no longer serve them, they break out into abuse of you, for "taking "part," as they call it, "against a defence-"less woman." This is their constant course; but the way is to pin them down to this alternative: "either agree in repro-"bating the acts in question, or confess "yourselves ready, if you had the opportu-"nity, of committing similar acts."——The perseverance of the MORNING POST in calling for vengeance upon the heads of the "infamous calumniators," as the editor calls them, is no more than might have been expected. But to call upon *the Prince of Wales* to punish them; to call upon the Prince of Wales, and tell him that he is "*bound* to "avenge the injured purity" of a person whom the writer acknowledges to have fallen into "some *trifling levities*:" this is most outrageously insolent. It is treating his Royal Highness like the wittol in the play, who, having first put his horns in his pocket, is bullied into a battle against the accuser of his wife. For my part, I believe the whole to be a fiction of the writer's in the MORNING POST. I do not believe that any report has been made; I believe that he is the real calumniator, in attributing "*levi-*"*ties*" to her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales; I believe that his chief object has been to vilify the Prince, in which I am sorry to say, that but too many of those, who ought to know better, are ready to join him. For this reason, and for many others; but, particularly for this reason, it behoves his Royal Highness, as he loves his kingdom and his character, to cause the much talked of report to be *published*, whenever it shall be made. He may be assured, that he has already lost much from *silence*. His calumniators spare not *words*, though they may not make much use of the *press*. Scandal does most execution when it is least noisy; and, by silent, secret, dastardly scandal no man's reputation was ever so perseveringly assailed as that of his Royal Highness. The non-appearance of the report relative to the late investigation is, by nine-tenths of the people, attributed to him, though it is evident, that the publication can be made by authority without his consent. In short, public opinion has been exactly the contrary of what one ought to have expected; nor is there any possibility of setting that opinion right, except by steadily pursuing a system of *publicity*.

THE NEGOCIATION is probably at an end by this time, to the great mortification of the gamblers in the funds, it being a matter of perfect indifference to every body else.—— The "*liberty of the seas*," will, I take it, be the great obstacle. Prevent us from searching neutral ships, and then France can carry on her trade in time of war as safely as in time of peace, while all other maritime nations will be rising upon the ruins of the English marine. This *cannot* be submitted to. To submit, at once, as an appendage to the Empire of France, would be nearly the same thing. Yet, upon no other terms shall we, in my opinion, ever have peace, *unless we immediately adopt, and resolutely adhere to, a new system of political economy*. Let this be resolved on; let another ten per centum be deducted from the dividends next year; let a similar deduction be added the year after, and we may safely defy the French Emperor and all his confederations.

N. B. A letter from Mr. Mc'ARTHUR would have been inserted, had it not come to hand at the same moment that I saw copies of it in the daily papers. It shall, nevertheless, appear next week.

HONORABLE A. COCHRANE JOHNSTONE.

TO THE PUBLIC.—Since the publication of my address, in Mr. Cobbett's Political Register of the 9th instant (page 203), there

have arisen certain circumstances, which would have produced, on my part, another address to the Public, which address, would have been accompanied with the whole of the correspondence between Lord Moira and others on the one part, and myself on the other part, relating to the Duke of York's conduct with regard to the applications made to him for the restoring of me to that rank in the army, which is my unquestionable due; but, being at present, in doubt as to the purport of a communication, which I understand is, by Lord Moira, shortly to be made to the Public upon the subject of a supposed error in my address, above referred to, I think it proper to wait until that communication shall have been made, in order that I may know distinctly upon what it is that it will be necessary for me to observe.—In the mean time, however, it appears necessary for me to give an explanation of the error, which has been made the subject of a letter from Lieut. Col. Gordon, Secretary to the Duke of York, and which letter was published in the Morning Post of the 14th instant, in the following words:—"Sir;—"An address to the Public, signed A. Coch-"rane Johnstone, having appeared in a "weekly paper of last Saturday, containing "the following words, viz." "*Mr.* "*M'Arthur, late Judge Advocate-Gene-*"*ral to the Navy, the day after I had* "*seen Lord Moira, informed me (agree-*"*ably to his letter, which I have now in* "*my possession), that he had, the day* "*before, been in company, at dinner,* "*with Lord Hutchinson, Colonel Gordon* "*(the Commander in Chief's Secretary),* "*and others; that a conversation had* "*taken place with regard to my case, and* "*that Colonel Gordon stated that it was* "*then before His Majesty; and he did* "*not doubt but that my name would* "*appear in the Gazette in a few days* "*as Major-General—*" "I think it "right to state, that Lord Hutchinson, "Mr. M'Arthur, and myself, were never "together in the course of our lives; and "that I have not, in the most remote man-"ner, the pleasure of Mr. M'Arthur's "acquaintance, never to my recollection "having seen him; and that I never did, "at any time or place, make use of any "such words as those attributed to me, or "of any words that could be so interpreted. "—I am, Sir, your humble servant, J. W. "Gordon."—The first thing to be noticed here, is, that the fact in question is by no means very material; for as the Public will perceive by referring to my address before-mentioned in the Political Register, (page 203), the great point in my statement was, that the Duke of York had assured Lord Moira, that he would recommend to His Majesty to confer upon me the rank of Major General. This was the material fact, because, as will be seen from Colonel Gordon's letter, in the Political Register, (page 205), the Duke of York had not, even long after I had received the above information from Lord Moira, entertained any intention to give such a recommendation to His Majesty. —The information given to me by Lord Moira was amply explicit and circumstantial; and, though forming a striking contrast to the information given to me by Colonel Gordon, was, as I believed, and as I still do believe, strictly true. It was, therefore, for the purpose of corroborating the statement of Lord Moira, that I introduced into my address, before referred to, what had been said by Colonel Gordon, in the presence of Mr. M'Arthur; and not for the purpose of bringing forward any new circumstance, none at all being necessary to elucidate the merits of the case, or to characterize the conduct of a principal party concerned. Nevertheless, there having been an error as to the mere identity of Col. Gordon, it is proper here to state, that it was another Colonel Gordon of the 67th Regiment, with whom Mr. M'Arthur had dined, as is stated in my former address, and whom he took for Colonel Gordon, Secretary to the Duke of York. This I learnt from an explanatory letter, written to me by Mr. M'Arthur, on the 14th instant, and not received, (owing to my being at a great distance from town) until the 18th instant. From this letter, it would appear, that there was some misconception on my part with respect to the parties at dinner; it would appear, that there were in question, two dinners in place of one; and, that Mr. M'Arthur, though he actually had the honour of meeting Lord Hutchinson at dinner, somewhere or other, (agreeably to the information which he has taken care now to repeat), had not the honour to meet his lordship in company with Colonel Gordon.—But, though these mistakes arising, apparently, from a harmless desire in Mr. M'Arthur to be thought familiar with great men, are very unimportant in themselves, it is not unimportant to observe, what has been the conduct of the real Colonel Gordon upon this occasion, and what inference naturally flows from that conduct. —It being now evident, that this Colonel Gordon was not the person with whom Mr. M'Arthur conversed, it is also evident, that the assertion attributed to him ceases to form a corroboration made by Lord Moira to me;

but the statement of Lord Moira still remains, and the conclusion to be drawn from it, as contrasted with the statement contained in the letter of Colonel Gordon of the 3d of May, still hangs suspended over the heads of the parties.—With respect to which of the parties is affected by that conclusion, the Public may, perhaps, be somewhat less decided in their opinion than they were before; but, if Colonel Gordon has, by his letter, removed a slight corroboration of the statement of Lord Moira, he has, by his silence, afforded a strong corroboration of the truth of that statement. For, when a man undertakes to remove the errors, which he finds in a statement respecting matters wherein he himself has been an actor, he undertakes to remove not a part, but the whole, of such errors. What are we, then, to conclude from the silence of Colonel Gordon with respect to the meetings, which, agreeably to the statement of Lord Moira, took place both with Colonel Gordon and the Duke of York, relative to the means to be used in order to obtain a restoration of my rank? In the part of my address, to which Colonel Gordon has thought it necessary to publish an answer, he is spoken of merely as having said, at a dinner party, that my case was before His Majesty, and that he did not doubt that my name would shortly appear in the Gazette; but, in another part of the same address, he is represented as having been one of those who assisted at consultations as to the mode in which the matter should be submitted to His Majesty with the fairest probability of success. Now, if this part of Lord Moira's statement to me be correct, it almost necessarily follows that the other material parts are correct also, it being altogether improbable that such consultations would have been held, had not the Duke of York expressed his readiness to recommend to His Majesty the measure in contemplation; and, if this part of Lord Moira's statement had been incorrect, will it be believed, that Colonel Gordon, having undertaken to correct errors in my address, would have suffered this most important error to pass entirely unnoticed? In short, there are few persons, who will not perceive of how much greater consequence it was to remove the effect of Lord Moira's statement, than it was to remove the statement of Mr. M'Arthur; and of course, it would be concluded, that Colonel Gordon left the statement of Lord Moira untouched, only because he knew it to be true.—Having explained the cause of the mistake, corrected with so much solemnity by Colonel Gordon, the subject must be permitted to rest here, until the intended communication of Lord Moira, above noticed, shall have been made to the Public.

A. COCHRANE JOHNSTONE.

Harley Street, 67,
August 18, 1806.

TO MR. COBBETT.

SIR;—I beg you to add this line or two, by way of Postscript, to the address which I sent you for publication on the 18th instant. —Since that address was written, I have seen in the Morning Chronicle, a letter from MR. M'ARTHUR, upon which I shall content myself with the following remark with respect to the two letters, which he informs the Public he wrote to me on the 11th and 13th instant, and which he complains of my not having noticed. The mistake made by MR. M'ARTHUR, will be found to be rectified in my address of the 18th and, as to an *answer* to the two letters, such was the style and [illegible] was impossible to answer [illegible] mode, and from adopting that mode I was prevented only by circumstances of locality.

A. COCHRANE JOHNSTONE

21*st August*, 1806.

St. James's Place,
Sir, August 14th, 1806.

In your paper of Saturday last there is an Address to the Public, in which the Honorable A. Cochrane Johnstone endeavours to arraign the Duke of York of inconsistency by contrasting a letter from the Military Secretary of his Royal Highness with a statement which he (Mr. Johnstone) supposes himself to have received from me. Mr. Johnstone will probably, in consequence of my having by letter indicated to him his misconception, request you to explain an error assuredly unintentional on his part. But in case he should omit it, your justice will lead you upon my testimony to clear up the mistake in such manner as you may think best. Conferences with other persons the substance of which I mentioned to Mr. Johnstone, have been misconstrued by him into repeated interviews with the Duke of York upon the subject in question: and on this ground the commander in chief is most erroneously taxed with first actively participating in measures suggested for the advantage of Mr. Johnstone and then subsequently disclaiming any knowledge of them. The imputation is completely unfounded, and could only have arisen

from the misapprehension to which I have alluded.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) MOIRA.

Mr. Cobbett.

Botley, Southampton,
18th August, 1806.

My lord,

I have but this day received the letter, which your lordship did me the honor to address to me on the 14th instant, and which, by being left at Mr. Budd's in Pall Mall, has been thus retarded on its way.—— While I feel conscious, that your lordship does not over-rate my love of justice, in supposing that I shall be ready to clear up any mistake, that Mr. Johnstone may, through the pages of the Register, have unintentionally led the public to adopt; while I am, in no common degree anxious to give effect to your lordship's wishes by publishing an explanation of what you consider as an error, I must confess, that I do not, from your lordship's letter, clearly comprehend the extent of those wishes.—— The main fact, in Mr. Johnstone's statement, is, "that, shortly after the change "of ministry, in February last, your lord- "ship told him, that the Duke of York "had assured you, that he would undoubt- "edly recommend to his majesty to confer "upon Mr. Johnstone the rank of Major "General." That fact, undenied, the statement remains unimpared, as to the conclusion therefrom to be drawn; and, I am totally unable to determine, whether, in your lordship's letter, that fact be intended to be denied, or to be admitted. It appears to me, therefore, that the mode, in which I shall be most likely to fulfil the desires of your lordship, will be to publish, in my next Number, your lordship's letter that I now have before me, which mode, unless I am apprized of your lordship's pleasure to the contrary, I shall conclude you approve of my adopting.——Begging leave to conclude with an expression of my deep regret, that a cause, which your lordship espoused from a high sense of its intrinsic justice, as well as of its importance to the army and to the preservation of public liberty, should have dwindled into a controversy as to *the manner of its being defeated.*

I remain, my lord,
your lordship's most humble
and most obedient servant.
WM. COBBETT.

To the Earl of Moira.

HANOVER.

Sir;—When we duly reflect on the number and weight of the calamities we have experienced since the year 1792, in consequence of war, we cannot be reconciled to its continuance on any other ground than that of absolute necessity. That, considering the enemy with whom we are now contending, such necessity may be felt, is no very improbable supposition. But can such a necessity arise, because the king of *England* merely happens to be elector of *Hanover?* I presume not. Whatever allegiance we may owe to our *English* sovereign, it does not in the smallest degree connect us in duty or in interest with *Hanover.* When the king of *England* engaged in the late, and again in the present war, the elector of *Hanover* took no part in the quarrel. We were left to support the contest by our own strength alone. *Hanover* was not even our ally. While so many other *German* states embarked with us in the war, *Hanover,* doubtless, from motives of self interest and prudence, shunned the alliance, and preserved a neutrality. It would, therefore, be in the highest degree unjust, that, because the common violator of continental territory seized upon *Hanover,* and bartered it away, the *English* nation should be called upon to make the elector reparation, or continue at war for the recovery of his *Hanoverian* dominions.—When we see *English* statesmen meddling with *Hanoverian* politics, and extending the sphere of war for *Hanoverian* interests, we are taught to look back to the origin of that claim which placed on the throne of *England* an elector of *Hanover.* It is found in the statute of the 12th and 13th of William III. c. 2, wherein it is enacted "That in case the crown and im- "perial dignity of this realm shall hereafter "come to any person, not being a native of "this kingdom of *England,* this nation be "not obliged to engage in any war for the "defence of any dominions or territories "which *do not belong to the crown of Eng-* "*land,* without the consent of parliament." —Here, then, the *rule* is, that no hereditary foreign dominion of her king, shall involve *England* in a war. And although a possible *exception* is admitted—that of the parliament's consent—it is evident that parliament could not be justified in yielding to the *exception,* unless a very strong case indeed, and a case wholly resting on *English* interests, could be made out —Has any such case been even debated in parliament? certainly not. What, then, is it that has befallen parliament, which induces a minister of this country to enter with foreign courts into *Hanoverian* politics, and to engage in *Hanoverian* wars, without first having the formal sanction of parliament, after debate

and deliberation, for such a proceeding? This, Sir, is a deep question, on which it becomes the people of *England* duly to reflect. *Blackstone*, according to my recollection, observes, that the caution against embarking in "war for the defence of any do-"minions or territories which *do not belong* "*to the crown of England*," introduced in so marked a manner into the statute by which the crown was settled on the *Hanoverian* family, proceeded from the painful remembrance of the vast treasures that were exhausted, and the rivers of blood that were shed by our ancestors in their absurd wars in *Normandy* and *France*, on account of the foreign dominions of their kings. He might, Sir, have farther remarked, that the caution he noticed was one of those *half-measures* of which the Gulielmine æra of our history furnished but too many examples, and of which posterity has tasted the bitter fruits. —The settlement of the crown was an act of the nation, made through its organ, the parliament, and was accompanied with sundry conditions and limitations; and it is greatly to be lamented, that, in order to have rendered the caution now under our consideration effectual, the parliament had not enacted, that no acceptance of the crown of England should be valid, unless accompanied with a complete abdication of all foreign dominion, as well as with an acknowledged incapability of ever holding with that crown any foreign dominion whatever; for, besides guarding against future wars, the statute declared that it was "requisite "and necessary that some future provision "be made for securing our religion, *laws*, "and *liberties*;" and it would have been no more than consistent and suiting the dignity of the nation to have said to a *German* prince, at the time of tendering him a throne, so jealous are we of our liberties, and of always living under laws made with our own concurrence, that, unless you consent to part with dominions where political liberty is unknown, and the people are in a condition, as we esteem it, of political servitude, we cannot think you qualified to rule over us, the people of England. How could we contemplate him, as the guardian of our freedom, whom we should behold elsewhere swaying an arbitrary sceptre?— By referring, Sir, to the statute I have quoted, you will see the several conditions and limitations under which the crown of this realm is settled upon his Majesty's family. As "the laws of *England*," says the act, "are the birth-right of the people thereof, "and all the kings and queens who shall "ascend the throne of this realm, ought to "administer the government of the same "according to the said laws," so it is enacted, that the sovereign shall conform thereto; that he shall take the coronation oath; that if he become a papist, or marry a papist, he "shall be subject to such incapaci-"ties" as the law has created; or, in other words, he shall be expelled from the throne; that he shall join in communion with the church of England; that he shall not go out of *Great-Britain* and *Ireland* without consent of parliament. It was also enacted, that all resolutions taken in the privy-council should *be signed by such of the members as should advise and consent to the same*; that no foreigner (although naturalized or made a denizen) should sit in the privy-council, or be capable of a seat in either house of parliament, or of any office of trust, civil or millitary*; or of accepting any grants from the crown of lands or hereditaments. It was also enacted, "*That no per-*"*son who has an office or place of profit* "*under the king, or receives a pension from* "*the crown, shall be capable of serving as* "*a member of the House of Commons*;" that judges shall only be removable by address of both houses of parliament; and that no pardon by the crown shall be pleadable to an impeachment by the commons.— And as, in respect to the king being of the Popish religion, or marrying a papist, the statute expressly says, that, "in all and "every such case and cases the people of "these realms shall be and are thereby ab-"solved from their allegiance," we have here (and in a case not of the highest political moment) a solemn parliamentary recognition of that fundamental principle of civil government, the principle of resistance, if ever the sovereign should break his contract with his people.—I notice this only to shew, how much it is the duty of those who understand the law and constitution of their country, to exercise, as becomes free and virtuous men, the liberty of the press for preventing such extremities.—The abovementioned provisions, for attaching responsibility to privy counsellors, and for excluding placemen and pensioners from the House of Commons, were repealed in the 4th year of Queen Anne. Whether those repeals have proved beneficial towards "se-"curing our religion, laws, and liberties," or the contrary, let the present situation of our country declare! On the most important

* What would the *English* parliament have thought, in the year 1700, of receiving into the *English* service a *German Legion* of thirteen thousand men?

of those two points, your own opinion, Mr. Cobbett, was made known to us, when you so properly and so honestly declared to the electors of Honiton, that you would not accept of any office or situation of emolument under the government. If we want fewer taxes and better accounts, I certainly am, with all due deference to Lord Henry Petty's experience and wisdom, decidedly of opinion, that instead of taking into pay a body of commissioners and auditors, we ought to put out of pay all *members* of the House of Commons, who are placemen and pensioners, and who, contrary to the clearest principles of the constitution, are, while the nominal servants of the people, the real servants of a power in a different, and too often an opposite interest. That his lordship, or any other minister or officer of the crown, should have a free entry into the House of Commons on public business, and the freedom of speech there, it cannot be necessary that he should occupy the seat of a *member*, or be permitted to *vote*. To *inform* the house, is one thing, to *vote* in that house, is another, and a very different thing. We receive from our architects, plans and estimates, and we listen to their explanations and arguments; but the care of our estates we trust to our stewards; and we should not be accounted a very wise people, if to our architects it were left, to assign the wages of our stewards; much less if our architects and tradesmen were allowed to choose those stewards, and to impose them upon us for seven years without our having a power of removal.—ALURED.

ON THE MODERN SYSTEM OF AGRICULTURE.

—— Hoc fonte derivata clades
In patriam, populumque fluvit.

SIR;

How far the effects, arising from the high estimation in which Agriculture now stands in Britain, will be ultimately beneficial, appears to be a question of great importance and extremely problematical. The agricultural mania which has for some time past prevailed among our nobility and gentry, has undoubtedly, produced great improvements in the several modes of various cultivation; and experiments tending to the advancement of agriculture, have been made at the expense of wealthy individuals, to which the contracted means of the mere husbandman or farmer would never have been adequate. It has, certainly, presented to the mind of the cultivator, a more enlightened view of his art. He has been taught to consider agriculture not merely as an ART, but, to reflect and reason upon the principles of the SCIENCE, which are so intimately connected with, and upon which depend successful practical result; by which means, much unnecessary labour and expense, are saved to the spirited farmer.—But, on the other hand, enormous evils have arisen from the system, which this fashionable mania has engendered and given birth to. Mr. Chalmers, in his valuable and concise "*Estimate of the comparative strength of Great Britain, at various periods*," has (page 317 et seq. edit. 1804) taken notice of "these calamitous effects;" and not only has he presented them to our view, in the magnitude of their mischief, but, he has also nquired into, and traced, the progress of ithis depopulating and destructive system of agriculture. Since the period of the accession of our present King, this system has been uniformly patronised, its views promoted, and its partizans encouraged by our leading characters. We have, already, a narrow minded, selfish, aristocratic yeomanry; a mercenary spirit has, for the most part, induced our nobility to descend from their station, to mingle in pursuits unworthy of them. Their province is to watch over the interests, and to direct the energies of the people, who support them in the maintenance of their splendour and superiority; not to usurp the places of the husbandman, the mechanic, or the manufacturer, to which they are, and ever will be, wholly incompetent. With some exceptions, they, perhaps, have thus debased themselves from a supposition that they can hence effectually and safely raise the value, and consequently the rent of their land. It is not difficult to detect the fallacy of this kind of argument, and to prove that, their misguided and uncontroled zeal is mischievous in the extreme; observation and research proclaim it; facts indisputable, confirm it. Nay, it is *particularly* injurious to themselves, for in raising the rent of the land to the present extravagantly high price, they have conduced to a more than equal rise in the price of articles of home produce, and of general consumption; and thus, the numeral increase in their rent-rolls, is not even nominal gain, but absolute loss; without adverting to the more material injuries which our export trade sustains in consequence of the increased price of labour and of raw materials. The evil still continues and increases, because they porsevere in the endeavour to retrieve themselves by the same means to which their present ignominious and reduced state is to be attributed. In the legislative branch of our government, their opinions are no longer considered or regarded in

the light they formerly were; disinterestedness is not now the characteristic of their arguments; and, however unwilling their submission may be, they *must* retire and give preeminence to the upstart, but more powerful trader. It obviously arises from the nature of the circumstances; when the House of Commons was composed of the two orders of our democracy, the country gentleman and the merchant, greater deference was necessarily paid by the executive government, to the advice of the former, than to the latter; but, in the present day, where are we to search for the INDEPENDENT? Not in the Commons House of Parliament; there, those who formerly prized this distinction above all other earthly honours, have consented, too readily, to become mere secondary traders; the effect of the system which we deplore. And, when the accelerated velocity of this momentous evil shall have attained to a certain degree, not only will its foremost partisans be annihilated by its power, but a general change and revolution will involve alike in one abyss of ruin, the nation and the individual.—The events which have happened in a neighbouring country fully justify this opinion, and, though the period of *our* dissolution may be protracted to a much greater length than that of France was, yet if we do not speedily make vigorous efforts to counteract this increasing evil, we may be assured the crisis will be equally disastrous and horrible.—If we look for the origin of this system, we must refer to the writings of such of the Encyclopædists who discussed Agrarian matters. Their enlightened and liberal speculations, led to innovations in this branch of political economics which, if they had been directed and regulated by the principles on which they were instituted, would most probably have proved permanently useful, and eminently conducive to national prosperity. It is well known, that the government which first noticed these productions, was that to which the writers belonged. These men had about the middle of the last century, acquired considerable influence in the court of France, through the medium of one of their principals. Louis XV. had attached himself to Dr. Quesnay, physician to the Marchioness of Pompadour. His Majesty was much pleased with the simplicity of detail with which the philosopher explained the principles of political economy, and was incited to introduce and effect a change in the prevailing notions and habits of his subjects on this head. The Marquis de Mirabeau, in publishing his philosophical work, entitled "*L'Ami des Hommes*," also contributed to this event. Although abounding in abstruse terms and abstract propositions, yet this work contains much valuable matter; and it promoted ample discussion on a subject which had already attracted the public attention. An infinite number of commentators and copyists sprung up, and thus a knowledge of these new opinions became generally diffused. The clearing of lands, the labours of the field, and rural economy were at that time the only topics of conversation. The immediate result was the formation of various societies of agriculture; that of Brittany was established on the 20th of March, 1757, and, shortly after, that of Paris; both with the approbation and under the declared patronage of the King. Louis, ever variable and sanguine, entered warmly into the new pursuit. The court, always the apes of a monarch's actions, promoted with the utmost zeal the wishes of Majesty. Noblemen, to some of whom, imperious etiquette had hitherto presented an obstacle to their avaricious and mercenary views, no longer thought it derogatory to their honour to attend to the labours of the field. The farmer was apparently more than ordinarily encouraged, in order that a knowledge of the useful practices of his art might be imparted to these wealthy, but ignorant intruders; who, having thus contracted a very partial acquaintance of these subjects, no sooner supposed themselves capable and efficient cultivators, than the progress of those deplorable evils which Mr. Chalmers * so forcibly de-

* "A revolution which has gradually "taken place during the last fifty or sixty "years, has lessened the number of suppliers, and added largely to the body of "consumers. The cottagers have been "driven into villages; the villagers have "been forced into towns; and the townsmen have been enticed into cities.—— "These evils are to be ascribed to our modern system of agriculture, which has not "effected even the salutary consequences "for which it is celebrated. By consolidating farms to an enormous extent; by "forcing cottagers from their hamlets; by "*pretending* to make much profit with little labour; it has depopulated and is depopulating the shires wherein it prevails. "While peers sink into peasants, and peasants rise into peers, the great body of the "people is pining in want.—Where is that "illustrious regiment which overthrew the "invincible phalanx, to find recruits, if

scribes, commenced; in addition to whose remarks, I would notice as not the least prominent of these evils, that the notions and ideas of the yeomanry and farmers, in their intercourse with the great, were inflated and perverted. Hitherto, they had been esteemed not only for their laborious and persevering industry, but for the uniform simplicity of manners, and habits of life, which prevailed among them; in a word, respectability and weight were attached to them; but, in moving or in the attempt to move into a higher sphere, they lost their consequence, and were no longer respectable or useful: it is needless to advert to the share which the *ousted* peasantry had in producing the revolution, and in the horrible crimes connected with it.—Although we can perceive occasionally the emanations of enlightened policy amid this perversion of principles, yet we must not attribute their establishment as laws, either to liberal and patriotic views, or to the superior wisdom and discrimination of the proposers and procurers of those laws. A few individuals possessed of powerful influence, in consequence of the new system, had been initiated into the details of mercantile profits, thought they should be enabled to extend their wealth and power, by that additional means which these edicts would furnish; and thus to interested avarice, and contracted partial views, are we to ascribe the edict published in France on the 14th of June, 1764, announcing and declaring an exemption from taxes and other impositions, all marshy lands which should be effectually drained, so as to be fit for the purpose of agriculture; and also, that published in the following month. This latter was certainly indicative of the existence of a more liberal policy than had hitherto prevailed, and promised to be eminently conducive to public welfare and individual convenience. The purport of it was to declare the corn trade entirely free between the several provinces of the empire, until that time most absurdly and mischievously restrained by the imposition of duties amounting almost to a prohibition: corn was thereby allowed to be imported in any quantity, on the payment of a very trifling duty; permits for this purpose which had previously been a source of considerable profit, exacted from the applicants by the agents and creatures of a minister or a mistress, were done away with. It also prohibited the export of corn from the ports and places on the frontiers, whenever its value should have risen in three consecutive markets to a certain alarming price; these maxima were subsequently named for the several provinces, varying according to the relative fertility, facilities of conveyance, and other contingent circumstances incident to the respective province.—But, strange as it may appear, the very persons who arrogated to themselves the honourable credit derived from those edicts, and the applause so enthusiastically rendered by that credulous and oppressed people, were at the very same time, counteracting them by monopolies, for the worst and most despicable purposes. However monopolies may be considered generally, as in part justified by the hazard of speculation, yet such a plea will not avail these corn monopolists of France, at the head of whom stood Louis XV. himself. As the certainty of gain depended upon themselves only, it cannot be regarded in any other light than an absolute public robbery; the result of this and many other such occurrences, is too well known, to require the detail of repetition here.——It is a matter of great and national concern, that the events which have of late years occurred in England, should afford so striking a parallel with some of those of France. And, we cannot but deplore the existence of an innate attachment to agrarian pursuits, in our beloved and gracious Monarch. He has set an example, undoubtedly laudable, with the best and most disinterested views; but, unfortunately, it has tended to produce a spirit of traffic among those whose minds should have been directed solely to government, legislative and other state affairs. At present, this aberration of talent and public duty, is attempted to be justified by his Majesty's high and dignified example; but, let it be observed, to all those who resort to it for a pretence and an excuse for their avowed conduct and concealed views, that laboured and spurious imitation is not to be compared to the genuine love of agriculture, and patriotic motives, which incite the Monarch, whose conduct in public and private life affords a rare example of affectionate solicitude for the welfare of the people, and virtuous disinterestedness for the advancement of science. How very few we shall find among this herd of interested soi-disant imi-

---

" sheep be driven into our northern glens,
" as a more valuable animal than the human
" race? Where shall our armies obtain the
" hardiest levies, if the villagers be forced
" into cities? Money cannot buy men;
" men are of more value than money," &c. &c. Vide Mr. Chalmer's Estimate, &c. p. 312 et seq. ed. 1804.

tators, and pretended patriots worthy to be ranked with a Guelph, a Coke, or an Arthur Young! It is necessary that the worms which are so fast destroying the foundation of our prosperity, and of our commonwealth, should no longer be suffered to pursue with impunity their mischievious schemes; and, it is ardently to be hoped that some able pen will expose to public view their secret atramentous practices, that they may be subjected to the obloquy which they so well deserve.——A.

FATE OF THE FUNDS.

Sir,——Want of leisure has till now prevented my troubling you with some observations, on the important discussions in the beginning of this year, in your valuable Register, on the Fate of the Funds, and the National Debt. It is not to be wondered at, that on a subject of such deep concern, there should be a considerable difference of opinion between you and your correspondents. The controversy has been so ably managed on one side by yourself, in your ninth volume, in pages 97, 225, 294, and 375; and on the other by your opponents D. N. page 47, Cornelius, page 188, and A. Z. or Mr. J. Scott Waring, pages 212 and 380, that I think it may be there safely rested and submitted to the judgment of the public. I have had no opportunity of examining whether the subject has been further discussed in your Register, but, I trust, that the arguments of your opponents will have convinced the few, who could entertain an idea so desperately mischievous, that your plan of ceasing to pay the interest on the national debt, or, in other words, declaring a national bankruptcy, is not more barbarous and cruel, unjust and dishonourable, unwise and impolitic, inexpedient and unnecessary, than it would be inevitably ruinous and destructive, to our individual and national prosperity. From the candour apparent even in the forcible manner in which you discuss political questions, I am not without expectation that you will express your conviction, that the plan suggested by your able correspondent D. N. p. 53. of redeeming the national debt by a sacrifice of part of the capital of every individual, to be applied to the liquidation of the debt is, if practicable, greatly to be preferred to your scheme, and is free from all the objections to it. The appeal your correspondent has made to the honourable feelings of his countrymen, to rouse them to the adoption of his proposal of paying their debts like honest men, instead of giving way to despondency and despair, might be greatly strengthened by shewing, in addition to the practicability of it, that their honour is not more deeply concerned in the measure than their interest.—To demonstrate this, it is necessary to consider the effect of the taxes on every man's income, in which, though there is much room for conjecture, several writers on political economy have endeavoured to arrive at a tolerable certainty. As long ago as during the war of 1739 to 1748, it was computed that the simple and complex operation of the taxes, consumed between 13 and 14s. out of every pound of the annual income of the nation. Subsequent writers computed this incumbrance to be 16s. 6d. out of every pound, about the beginning of the American war. When we consider the enormous addition to the national debt, and the taxes laid on to pay the interest of it in the subsequent wars, we are in no danger of being beyond the mark in agreeing to the latter computation. This being the case, the owner of every kind of property must admit, that it is demonstrated to be his interest to part with so small a proportion of his nominal property as a tenth or a twelfth, which would, I apprehend, be sufficient, as his contribution to get rid of the incumbrance of the national debt. When his income shall be relieved by a proportionate reduction of the taxes, the real net sum every man would have to spend out of his income, would probably, be three times as much as before; or, what amounts to the same thing, perhaps he might buy three times as much with the same money. The difficulty lies in the means of accomplishing a measure, as your correspondent well expresses it, of such gigantic magnitude. But when all parties agree in the incalculable evils of our national debt, and in the necessity of adopting the most vigorous means of obviating them, we must not be appalled by difficulties, nor suffer our minds to shrink from a task on which our existence as an independant nation depends.——The capital of the nation is fully equal to the requisite exertions, and your correspondent has, I apprehend, fallen considerably short of its real value, in estimating it at two thousand millions. The value of land in Great Britain, which he takes at *eight hundred millions*, was estimated by Mr. Pitt in 1798, including tythes, mines, timber, and houses, at *twelve hundred and fifty-two millions, one hundred and twenty-five thousand pounds.* The advance on rents since that time is taken very low at one-fifth, which will increase the whole value of lands, &c. to about *fifteen hundred millions.*

Your correspondent estimates the personal property of this kingdom, including the value of the national debt at *twelve hundred millions.* As long ago as 1748, this property was estimated at *one thousand one hundred millions.* Consider the increase since that time of the national debt itself, which, though a burden on the public, is part of the property of individuals. Take further into the account the immense and prosperous trade which this country has since carried on, and the various ways in which that trade has conduced to the increase of our personal property; and, I apprehend that your intelligent correspondent will agree with me, that the personal property of the kingdom is not exaggerated at fifteen millions more. We shall thus find the amount of the capital of the kingdom, arising from both descriptions of property to be *three thousand millions.* This is the real fund for the payment of the national debt. With such ample means in our hands, can any thinking person doubt of our ability to do it? Your correspondent appears to have fallen into an error in talking of paying off the funds at par. The 3 per cent. and the 5 per cent. stocks were not funded or borrowed at this rate, and each should be valued as an annuity of £3 or £5, as indeed they actually are valued in the market for them, and it would be sufficiently liberal, to give to the holders a small bonus on the market price. This mode of paying off the funds, which it must be admitted is equitable between the holders and the public, will reduce the amount to be paid in money greatly below the calculation of your correspondent.—I concur with your correspondent, p. 51, in lamenting that the highly respectable Bishop of Llandaff, who is an advocate for this plan of redeeming the national debt, by a general tax on property, has not further illustrated his ideas, or shewn how they can be reduced to practice. This appeal to the Right Reverend Prelate, is a call on every one who has reflected on this momentous subject, to contribute his endeavours to draw the attention of the public, and of ministers to it. In offering myself to your correspondent as a fellow-labourer in this political vineyard, I trust he will find some assistance from my humble efforts, as I have not only thought long and deeply on the subject, but have already ventured to lay those thoughts before the public, in "Proposals for paying off the whole of the present national debt, and reducing taxes immediately," first published in 1799, and republished in 1803, (by Rivington, Stockdale, and Richardson,) at the time when the threat of destruction by the invasion of an enemy equally formidable and relentless, rendered it the imperious duty of every individual amongst us, to exert all his powers in the common cause.—Though I have hitherto failed of carrying into the minds of the public, that conviction of the practicability of my scheme, which long reflection had impressed on my own, I trust that the increased and increasing pressure of our burdens, the embarrassments of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to draw out any thing new from the almost exhausted mine of taxes, and the necessity of which all seem convinced that something effectual must be done, to prevent our sinking under them, will now more forcibly draw the public attention to my proposals.——That they differ in some respects from the plan of your correspondent, though agreeing with him in principle, may be attributed to his unwillingness to exceed the small space you could allow in your Register, for the discussion and detail of a subject, which even in a pamphlet could only be imperfectly explained. It would require a volume to show all the various evils arising from the magnitude of the national debt, and the constant and alarming increase of taxes, which by their simple and complex operation in constantly advancing the price of every thing we consume, swallow up more than three-fourths of every man's income, to defray our public expenses and pay the interest of the national debt; whilst the situation of our poor is daily becoming more distressing; and the consequent high wages of our manufacturers add so much to the price of our manufactures, that in a few years all our boasted superiority will be lost, and other nations less burdened with taxes, will drive us out of every foreign market.—Shall we wait till our poor are starving, our manufactures ruined, and our whole incomes absorbed, before we apply any remedy to this consuming evil? If we do, no other measure will then be in our power, but the desperate one you propose of national bankruptcy. But if we now consent to a sacrifice of one twelfth of the property of every description, real and personal, of every individual amongst us paying taxes, we should at once get rid of all our difficulties, and our future resources rescued from the impending destruction, would be inexhaustible.——To talk of a sacrifice in such circumstances is a misapplication of terms. What is proposed is, that each person shall pay off his proportion of the complex burdens, consuming nearly the whole of his income by parting with a small part of his property. It would

be purchasing a perpetual annuity at a low rate. It would be paying off an usurious mortgage, and every man, and every man's family, would be infinitely richer after the apparent sacrifice of a twelfth of his capital, applied to pay off his simple proportion of the taxes at a rate of about 5 per cent. with a bonus of getting released from the complex operation which consumes above 75 per cent. of his income.—The principle of my plan is shewn by the redemption of the land tax, a definable incumbrance on a specific species of property paid off by each landholder chargeable therewith. The nature of the plan is to extend this principle, by charging every description of property with the purchase of an amount in the funds equal to its tax.—The practicability of the plan is proved by the income and property taxes, which have removed the greatest difficulty in the way of paying off the debt by a general tax on capital, by establishing the principle and devising the means of ascertaining the real and full amount of every one's principal or capital yielding income.—If these taxes are objectionable, an account of the annual recurrence of an inquisitorial scrutiny into every man's affairs, this evil will cease on my plan, after one rigid exertion; for, I agree with your correspondent, that no consideration of risk arising from disclosure of property; no subterfuge or evasion of any description must be permitted, to prevent a true and full disclosure of each person's property.—I should trespass too much on your limits, if I were here to enter further into the detail of the plan that I have proposed, for carrying this grand national measure into execution, for which I must necessarily refer you to my pamphlet. This measure or an efficacious approximation to it, matured by the united wisdom of the nation in parliament, appears to me the only effectual means of discharging the debt, and diminishing the taxes, without injustice to the holders of any description of property; all of whom ought to be equally protected, and equally liable to contribute to any sacrifice necessary to the general relief. Should I finally succeed in conjunction with your correspondent, in convincing the first Lord of the Treasury, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, of the necessity of bringing this grand measure before parliament, I shall be proud of the honour, of having attempted to lay the corner-stone, on which I flatter myself that more able architects may erect a column capable of supporting the over-burdened fabric of the British Empire; and of restoring it to a stability which may for ages defy the impotent attempts of its enemies to destroy it.—Such have been the changes in men, measures, and political events in the course of a few years, that in my pamphlet there are some things not applicable to the present day, which your candour will pass over. As you have invited a free discussion of this great national question, I shall make no apology for requesting the insertion of my ideas on it in your Register. We have the same great object of the public good in view, and if we differ in the means of attaining it, we will differ with the freedom of Englishmen.—H. M. Bird.—*London, Aug.* 12, 1806.

SINKING FUND.

To the Rt. Hon. Charles James Fox.

Sir,——Having committed myself, to the length I have done, on the subject of the Sinking Fund, I feel stimulated, by every motive which led to the commitment, to shut up every avenue through which folly may view its merits, or, to open every channel through which my own ignorance of its effect cannot be misconceived. I deny it to be a fund, in any sense of the word to which mankind have hitherto attached the idea of a fund; first, because it is not a sum of money, or quantity of any thing else, laid up in store, or lodged in the hands of a second party, for the purpose of its being applied to any particular use; and secondly, because it is not the surplus of our property, or annual income, after all our wants are satisfied, which is annually applied to the liquidation of our debt: for it is but *too well known*, and *severely felt*, that the *utmost* exertions of our labour and economy *cannot* realize, or save property sufficient to supply the wants of any other description of people than those of our naval and military establishments, and those of such as have monopolised a share of the general stock which necessarily leaves that of others insufficient to supply their wants. And denying the Sinking Fund to be either the one or the other of these descriptions of funds, I insist, that if it be a fund at all, it is of this nature.—The labour of the nation, or the number of labourers annually employed to raise its annual supply, is a *fund*. Out of this number of labourers the extortions of the loan-mongers, as I have already stated it, and shall again shew it, impressed a given number of labourers to create a collateral fund, called *Stocks*, or *Stocking Fund*; and to create the interest paid upon this fund, government *dragged out* from the national fund, another given

number of labourers; but less in the proportion, which the interest bears to the capital. The Stocking Fund, or produce of the labour, so impressed by the loan-mongers, amounts, nominally, to above, but say 600 millions; and the interest of it, or produce of the labour, so *dragged out* by government, at 4 per cent. to 24 millions. Finding at last, that the seizure thus made by government from the public fund, of labour, property, or money, as you may think proper to call it, left too few labourers, or too little property to find the community at large with the common necessaries of life, or that paupers were rapidly encreasing in number (as must naturally be expected, when we recollect the action and reaction of the funding system, or, to make use of more intelligible language, of the drafts made by the loan-mongers and government, from the national fund of supply) it was resolved upon, by the financial luminary of 1786, "the pilot who weathered the "storm in 1802," to lay violent hands on the remaining part of the general stock of labour or property, to the amount, *now*, of 600 millions, and give it to the stock-holders, in lieu of the 24 millions annually, which they receive in interest; or applying the principle to labours, to give to the stock-holders the labour of as many men as must be employed to create a capital of 600 millions to recover from them the labour of those who are annually employed to create interests to the amount of 24 millions, which they receive; and to the number of labourers thus transfered, *in the true spirit of vassalage*, to the stock-holders, *he thought it proper* to give the name of *Sinking Fund*. Do I, Sir, or do I not, understand the nature and principles of the Sinking Fund? Do I conceive, or misconceive its bearings on the national fund of labour? Taking it for granted, that I do not, I must observe, that a less consummate degree of political folly and vice could not, perhaps, recommend Mr. Pitt to the stock exchange gentlemen, and their dupes, as a man whose memory ought to be handed down to the latest posterity in brass or stone; for certainly, if he knew what he was about, the nation was nothing in his estimation, if he could but keep good faith and friendship with them, —them who had extorted from the labour of the nation, the 600 millions which he and his predecessors squandered away to gratify the avarice of another distinct part of the community, in their interests, and habits; I mean the merchants, or those who are only *mere dealers* in the articles which the national labour creates. But, Sir, will you, in defiance of ocular demonstation, tread in his steps, and finish the work of destruction which, in the *arrogance* of his state *pride*, and the *stupidity* of his financial *ignorance**, he had commenced and carried on for eighteen years? Are you, Sir, so eminently unqualified to realize the hopes reposed in your natural talents and political integrity, in an administration composed of all the virtue, talents, and property of the country, as not to perceive, in a moment, that the sinking fund multiplies the evils which it is intended to remove, in the proportion which 600 millions bear to 24 millions, or in that between the number of labourers that must be employed to raise such a capital and that which are employed to create the interest of it? And, Sir, can you misconceive the reason to be, that the action of the funding system *in converting labourers into independant stock-holders*, and its reaction *in pressing labourers to support the stock-holders*, have so far reduced the national fund of labour or property, as to have converted above one sixth of the population into paupers, and therefore so far as not to have left the Sinking Fund, a *single man*, or *a single shilling* wherewith to annihilate the funding system, without *multiplying the number of paupers, in the proportion of twenty-five to one*; which is that which the capital of the debt bears to its interest, at 4 per cent? This, Sir, appears to me so plainly evident, to be the cause and effect, that I do no more know how to misunderstand its being so, than I do how to forget that I hold, in my hand, the pen with which I write my sentiments. But, Sir, this *action* and *reaction* of the funding system, form, but two of the many fatal collateral modes in which it operates on the national fund of labour. The number of men, who are annually supported by the sum annually funded, and who are employed to fight the battles of merchants and stock-holders, as such, are unavoidably taken from the national fund of labour, either directly or indirectly; and, therefore, if this fund merits any attention at all, the question will be, (with those who

---

* I shall in any manner required, beg pardon of Mr. Rose, and the "*bed of* "*roses*" Lord Castlereagh, if by proving to the world the falsehood of my notions of the *nature* and *bearings* of the Sinking Fund, they will prove to the public, that these epithets are *falsely* or *maliciously* applied on my part.

must have a large army, rendered incapable of sympathising with the people, because it is to be "distinct from them in its manners, habits, and pursuits,)" *not how many men may be demanded* by the merchants and stock-holders to preserve *their independance of labour; but how many can be taken from the fund,* and not reduce us to a famine, or be the means of losing our national independance by France? The solution of this question, however, depends upon the solution of another two, namely, *how many men have we annually employed in useful labour?* and *how many,* more or less, *ought to be employed,* so as to make our annual supply *sufficiently abundant, and no more?* As to the number annually employed in useful labour, I shall by and by, give something in the shape of a statement. With respect to the Sinking Fund and funding systems, and as this may have been the first effort made to decide their merits, by shewing their bearings on the national fund of labour; and as, therefore, the principle may be observed in its application to those who have not hitherto thought of it; I will re-state a case, which appears to me analogous in all its circumstances. Suppose it to be the case of an individual, that the interest which he annually pays to his creditors have put every one of his family on short allowance, except himself, and those upper servants who have his stores under their care. Under this circumstance, could he promise to himself any thing from an attempt to pay off his debt, but the necessity of taking charge of his stores himself, if any were left, of reducing his upper servants to under ones, and of turning his under ones out of doors, to beg, or starve, if they could not find another employer? Is there a circumstance belonging to this case which does not strictly apply to the different orders of the state; except the difference between the relation in which the individual stands to his servants and creditors, and that in which governments stand to the public, and public creditors. He is *only* a debtor and a master, government is neither the one or the other—it is a parent, or ought to be so, and the public creditors and the public, are its lawfully begotten children. Government, therefore, cannot do with the public as he has done with his servants, with forfeiting every tittle to the honour, love, and obedience, which is naturally due from children to their parents. Seeing, then, on the clearest principles of reason and demonstration, that every attempt to do justice between debtor and creditor, in the *usual way,* diminishes the annual supply and multiplies the poor-rates in the proportion stated; Government must break the faith, foolishly pledged to the public creditors, and invest them again in the general fund of labour, out of which their extortions, as money dealers, and prior to that, as merchants, rose them into independance, otherwise, on the principles of cause and effect, the public must either beg, starve, emigrate, or rebel; and in either case the relation between parent and children is destroyed; and that, not of master and servants, *but of monster and his victims,* is established, with *all its consequences.* There may, however, be little or nothing in this argument, sufficiently strong and clear, to prevent ignorance and fraud from terrifying us out of our senses with the consequences of cruelty and bad faith towards the stock-holders,—the number of whom, I have the best authority for saying, amounts to six hundred thousand, exclusive of their wives, children, butlers, valets, footmen, cooks, confectioners, coachmen, grooms, huntsmen, and the incalculable number of able hands, that are *other ways* employed in, an incalculable number of ways to furnish the luxuries in which they generally wallow. One consequence, it must be admitted, would be, that a complete check would be given to the facility of borrowing loans, to support armies, *taken from the national fund of labourers,* for the purpose of fighting the battles *of merchants,* who in their turn have wives, children, butlers, valets, footmen, cooks, confectioners, &c. &c. to provide for; but against this consequence I place our national security against beggary, famine, emigration, rebellion, or slavery to a foreign yoke, as such security must naturally arise from the investment of such stock-holders and their numerous collaterals, in the national fund of useful labour as are capable of being useful. And taking it for granted, that I have in this respect chosen of *two* evils, *by far* the least, I ask you, Sir, as the common parent of the public creditors and public, in your capacity of statesman, would you choose *by far* the greatest of two evils merely to keep, what *they call,* good faith with six hundred thousand, whom, though one of their number, I call extortioners, and dupes? I say extortioners and dupes.—Extortioners, because the money which they lent to the merchants, *not to the nation, is a surplus, over and above their taxes, and every other charge they could possibly have to pay,* which they extorted from the public, either in the interest of money, "*which*

"*only cost them the paper on which they* "*write,*" or in the price which they made no hesitation to charge, on the articles in which they dealt before they became dealers in paper money; and dupes, because they were simple enough to flatter themselves, that the national fund of labour, or wealth could for ever stand the annihilating action and re-action of the funding and unfunding systems. The stock-holders, and merchants, however, will perceive that I am not so much blaming their patriotism, morals, or intellects, as I am endeavouring, first to point out the vicious principles, of a vicious system, or more properly, the vicious length to which such system is carried; for principles are only vicious as they *stop us short of*, or *lead us beyond* our object. And secondly, to exhibit those principles which nature has formed to counteract its operations, and for which it cannot find a permanent substitute. I have stated that preparatory to the erection of a large mercenary army, or the application of the Sinking Fund, it becomes a necessary question to solve, how many men can *safely* be taken from the national fund of labourers, to form such army, &c.; and also that the solution of that question must be regulated by our knowledge of the number required in the national fund to keep our annual supply sufficiently abundant and no more; and by that of the proportion between the number of those who are annually employed in useful labour, and that of those who are not so employed; for the abundance or scantiness of the annual supply must depend upon this proportion, including the skill, dexterity and judgment with which labour is applied. In their natural order, the last of these questions must be the first that is answered; I, therefore, beg your attention to the following statement. According to the census taken under Mr. Abbot's act of parliament, the population of England and Wales were then estimated at 9,343,578, of which there were given as employed in agriculture 1,787,675; and in trade, and mechanism 1,896,485, making together, 3,634,160. Those who are employed in agriculture, trade, and mechanism, constitute the productive fund of national labour, and which substracted from the population, gives the unproductive fund at 5,709,418. It would, however, be extremely erroneous to suppose that the annual supply bears the same proportion to the annual consumption of the two funds which 3,634,160, the productive fund bears to 9,343,578, the population, or two funds. The unproductive fund, several descriptions of persons who cannot be considered otherwise than as mere nominal labourers; and therefore, the supply is less in the proportion between their number and that of the real labourers. These descriptions are, 1st. Those farmers, tradesmen, and mechanics who attend to their hounds, hunters, and tables, and not to their business; and who, therefore, waste and consume the annual supply in more than the proportion which their number bears to that of those, who do the labour of their callings. 2d. Their wives, children, livery and maid servants. 3d. The infantile. 4th. The aged, and 5th. The infirm parts of the agricultural, mechanical, and mercantile labourers. The proportion which these descriptions may bear to the whole fund of agriculturalists, mechanics, and tradesmen is a mere speculative question and therefore, every man who can produce a good reason for it, must be at liberty to call the truth of my statement in question; but judging of its amount, from the number of these descriptions, which we see attached to the families of the farmers, mechanics, and tradesmen; I take it at two fifths, or 1,453,664, which substracted from 3,634,160 the whole gives the efficient fund of labourers at only 2,180,496 or about one fifth of the population, so that about four fifths, or 7,163,082 out of 9,343,578; remains according to my hypothesis an actual unproductive fund. Consequently our annual supply is less, by about four fifths, than it would have been were the population actually employed in agriculture, mechanism and trade. To attempt, however, to carry the principle of *political economy* thus far, could be no less visionary and crude in theory than it would be immoral and impolitic in practice; but what security have we, Sir, that it will be less visionary in theory, or immoral, and impolitic in practice, to attempt to carry the principle of *political profligacy*, so far as to take a mercenary army, and hands sufficient to liquidate the national debt from the small productive fund of 2,180,496 of labourers still remaining. Remember, Sir, that every labourer, apparently, has to carry about four *drones*, each of them heavier than himself, and therefore, that should he slip off his balance, down they come, with a very different violence from that which they would receive were the gentle arms of the law to hand them down to the ground from which they ignorantly crawled up to his skin and bone shoulders.

I am, Sir, &c. C. S.

BOARD FOR AMERICAN CLAIMS.

Quod verum atque decens curo et rogo, et omnes in hoc sum.

SIR,——It was not my intention to have addressed you in corroboration of the facts contained in my former letter; they are too deeply impressed upon the minds of all the unfortunate and much injured British merchants, who traded to America before the destructive war with that country, to require illustration, nor is any proof of their existence necessary, beyond their bare enumeration. It is, however, incumbent upon me, to notice the observations of A. B. in your last Register, who, whether his information is or is not to be relied on, is certainly as much entitled to attention, as the person who addressed you in the Register preceding the last, and who now, in defence of his former observations, again takes up the pen.——"Nothing extenuate, or set down aught in malice," if a writer be permitted to decide upon the purity of his own conduct, guided me, when I formerly addressed you; and, I beg you to be assured, such was my intention, and I trust, I shall not depart from that rule of conduct. A. B. differs from me, most materially so. He is pleased to assert, that your correspondent is mistaken, "as to the cause which put an "end to the proceedings of the Board at "Philadelphia;" and his information induces him to apprehend, that, "certain "leading principles" were established, which would "have gone far to determine "much of the business before them." I think, Sir, it is fair to conclude, from the two latter quotations I have selected, that the observation I made in my former communication, that *not a single case before the Board at Philadelphia was actually decided*, is correct: were it otherwise, A. B. would as he has done as to other parts of my observations, I think, have negatived that indisputable fact. With respect to the incorrectness of my observation, in the estimation of A. B., "as to the cause which put an end "to the proceedings of the Board at Phila-"delphia," I must observe, for his information, and in doing so, I merely repeat the fact advanced by me in my former communication, that my assertion, "as to the "cause which put an end to the proceed-"ings of the Board at Philadelphia," is literally correct: other causes may possibly have conjointly assisted in the termination of that Board; but, if there were any such, I am not aware of them, or, that the little differences sometimes occurring in the Board, could possibly lead to such disastrous consequences. Perhaps, Sir, it may be alleged against my veracity, that interested, and largely interested, as I am, I may have embellished my statement, and, that a more implicit reliance should be placed in the assertions of A. B., who is not, for it is fair to conclude he is not, interested, as he does not profess so to be. But, Sir, what could possibly be the motive with a ruined and almost broken hearted victim to the proceedings of our trans-atlantic ci-devant brethren, to depict in false colours, the distresses I, in common with hundreds of most respectable mercantile characters, have laboured and still do groan under. Such conduct would neither add to that character I have used my endeavours, through a long series of years, some of which, and I can scarcely refrain from falling into a womanish weakness at the mention of them, proclaimed me, not the meanest amongst my mercantile brethren, to maintain, with the strictest regard to truth, and a good conscience; nor, would it be attended with the least benefit to me, the generally supposed *primum mobile* with men of my calling. *De paupertate tacentes plus poscente ferent.*——I solemnly declare, Sir, it was not my intention to assert, nor have I advanced one fact, but what either my own conviction, or the assurance of persons who were well acquainted with certain facts, which I could not possibly know, and whose veracity I have no reason to doubt a reliance upon, enabled me to advance with the strictest propriety. For the information, Sir, of A. B., should he not be acquainted with the facts I now advance, and which corroborate my former assertion, as to the cause producing the unfortunate annihilation of the Board in America, I must observe, that on the 16th July, 1799, when it was deemed necessary, to vindicate that essential privilege of perfect and uncontrouled freedom of observation, by reference to the States of America having been in a state of rebellion, with respect to Great Britain before the peace, it was observed, by a member of the Board in America, that he held it to be his duty, not to assist at deliberations, but to discontinue his attendance, at a board where such sentiments were declared; that he would not sit to hear the sovereignty of his country called in question, and he held it to be his duty to withdraw; the commissioner did withdraw, and did not afterwards give his attendance; but, Sir, it is unnecessary to dwell on circumstances, inducing such determination, which has involved us in additional years of delay; nor, should I have again referred to the unwelcome sub-

ject, if A. B. had not doubted my assertion in this respect; had he stated *his* conceptions of the cause inducing the Board to suspend their deliberations, it might then have been weighed against my assertions. The relief intended for us, and which the government of this country, at the time of the settlement of the convention with America, compounded for, when more ought to have been, and I am induced to believe, might have been exacted from the American government, I have in my former communication, stated to be inadequate to our demands. In this most material assertion, I stand uncontradicted; and, whenever even the small scanty pittance, which will be ultimately apportioned amongst us, or rather amongst our creditors, shall be dealt out, for the long suffering merchant will not be much benefited by the division, when he has settled with his creditors, who have patiently and fruitlessly waited for the result of the execution of that aith between nations, the fulfilment of the terms of existing treaties; I think it will be found, that I have not erred, when I declare my inability to determine upon the hour, when I might receive a single shilling of my claims, which were not compounded for by existing treaties, but were undertaken to be paid to me in full. It is immaterial, Sir, whether the remuneration of a board is considered under the head of salary, allowance, pension, sum of money for current expenses of office, or gratuity; nor, is it material to consider, whether it is easier to overrate services by the year, than it would be, were official persons to attempt to magnify services with a view to remuneration, when the duties of office are gone by; because, the gentlemen composing the present board, have, I am told, always conducted themselves with the strictest propriety, and have held the appendage of office but as a secondary object. But, A. B. will, I think, agree with me, that, however meritorious the inducements of the gentlemen who compose the board in accepting their arduous situations are, and however independent their several stations in life may be, totally precluding the most distant suspicion, that they would lengthen the duration of their proceedings for the sake of the lucre of office, it cannot be inferred, that they accepted and hold their offices gratuitously. Sir, in the settlement of a concern of such magnitude as that before the board, *plus aloes quam mel is habet.* —I would have them *liberally* remunerated, and if my information is correct, they have no reason to doubt a full remuneration for their laborious undertaking, though they may not hitherto have been *amply* rewarded for their current services.—But, Sir, though they may, and I sincerely hope will, receive ample compensation for their labours, yet, the creditors, can never expect to receive from the fruit of their exertions, ample retribution; the utmost that may be awarded to me, I collect from A.B's. concluding paragraph, may amount to 4s. 9d½. in the pound, upon the sum to be awarded, and this is to be the compensation to men, to whom the government of this country are not less indebted, than to a description of persons, who have been amply paid; nay, who have been most liberally remunerated, I mean the American Loyalists. Sir, I am of opinion, but, perhaps, the rank I once held amongst my mercantile brethren may be considered to have some influence in the formation of that opinion, that, the merchants' character is of infinitely more importance in the link of society, than any other, or, than it is generally held to be. When it is considered, the vast consequence the merchant is, as contributing his powerful assistance to the increase of seamen, without which, the country never would have reared its predominant head as happily it has done, continues to do, and will, I trust unto the end of time; largely adding to the revenue of the country, and the means of inducing individuals of all nations to invest their property in this emporium of the world, by the additional credit he collectively adds to the character it has attained to for good faith and responsibility, increased by the merchants endeavours and exertions. Surely, the man contributing to such increased and increasing benefits, should not be neglected. If the loyalists, many of them unknown perhaps, until the hour that parliament so liberally determined to relieve their necessities; and who, but for the circumstances of a few, who actually suffered in their property, would have continued for ever in the shade of night they had been accustomed to, and from whom this country never received a single benefit, have been so amply paid, so generously remunerated for the loss of property, which, in some cases was partly ideal, why is the merchants' that solid staple character of Britain, to be sent into the world to recommence his career, with extreme age, and all its concomitant infirmities, with less than one-eighth of his bonâ fide claims, which, by existing treaties and the pledge of those persons who composed the government when they were entered into, were to be paid in full? Sir, the merchant has a superior claim to the justice

of the nation, and I still hope, though the board cannot, for they have it not in their power to award payments of a shilling, beyond the extent of £600,000, that the justice of the country is yet awake to the calls of its injured and insulted subjects; from the justice of America I expect nothing; I never did expect any from the hour she became separated from the parent country, and I find I have not been deceived in the expectations I had formed. A. B. informs us, that, according to present appearances, a *second* 12 per cent. may possibly be given to the creditors; should this be the case, though many of us, I fear, will not live to partake of the long promised *first* 12 per cent. America should have been induced, if not to have adhered to the faith of treaties, still to have conceded terms more favourable to this country, and paid over to the government £1,200,000, (or to speak with correctness, as the ratio of 4s. $0\frac{1}{2}$ is to £1. which would be somewhat less) instead of £600,000; the amount of claims I have already considered to be 5 millions, which, as it remains uncontradicted by A. B. may be presumed to be correct; the two 12 per cents. which it appears from A. B's. statement may possibly be paid, produce short of a fourth part of 5 millions, but to avoid minute calculations and fractions, I take the ratio at a fourth, then, by this calculation, I may receive, and more it seems I cannot receive, 5s. in the pound upon my claims; surely, then, America should have been induced to have paid £1,200,000, instead of one half of that amount; but, as America has not been inclined as a nation, to adopt payment to that extent, for as to individual justice, I put that totally out of the question, and ever did since the peace of 1783. Britain, in my opinion should, nay, it should go further. I should hope, the principles of justice by which this country has been always governed, will not for the first time be cast aside, in withholding payment of the deficiency, which, perhaps, from political motives, she may have been induced not to exact from our former transatlantic brethren, from a meritorious body of men, and a most useful class of subjects. I cannot agree with A. B. in his view of the "publicity" of the proceedings of the Board, nor can I subscribe to his opinion, that the notice of the 7th of May, 1803, gives all possible publicity to their proceedings. The inspection authorised by that notice, is confined to the papers of the *creditor* only, such as accounts and lists of the creditors claim, a reference to which, would have no connexion whatever with the decisions or discussions of a claim, which the Board have considered or made any decision upon, and which reference in the terms of the notice was for the purpose of procuring information from creditors, to enable the Board to reject cases brought before them. I trust, however, that applications have not been made under such notice, a proceeding the beneficial tendency of which I cannot discover. If such notice or tendency, be the definition of publicity, a court of justice, sitting in judgment upon the case of a merchant, who seeks to recover a debt due upon a bill of exchange, might close its doors and tell persons who complained of the want of publicity, that all possible publicity is given, by reference to the lawyer who is employed by the merchant to bring his business into court, from whom he may obtain access to the papers, and by reference to the person employed by the court to take care of the law papers; such similar publicity is *that* in the present case; but, although such is adopted, it is far from me to condemn the Board, who act professedly under an act of parliament, vesting in them unlimited powers; but, I cannot agree with A. B., that the trust reposed in them is without precedent. It would be impossible for parliament, to inquire into a report upon the cases of a variety of individual claimants, and it would not be probable that any persons, collectively or incividually, could so well and accurately decide upon reports, as those who had minutely examined into the basis of such reports.—— High as the responsibility of the Board is, and honourable as the result of their conduct and decisions will I trust be to the members of it, I feel quite at ease as to the rectitude of ultimate decisions. I have before advanced, and I repeat, it is not the gentlemen composing the Board I have the temerity to condemn, but, it is the inadequacy of their appointments, it is the impossibility of their granting relief, to the extent the government of the country should have enabled them to have extended to the unfortunate sufferers, I deplore. Still, however, I hope much from the penetration and humanity of the Board, and I trust, that should they hereafter deem the unsatisfied creditors, proper objects of relief from the equity of parliament, that their weighty and just recommendation will not be withheld. *Pauperiatis pudor et fuga*; is much too much for a man to reflect upon without emotion, who has spent a considerable portion of his life, not unattended with benefit to his country, although, undoubtedly, a view to his

own interest may have been blended with it.—So far as concerns myself, I have shewn no reluctance to afford explanation; and, I must declare A. B's. observation to be harsh, which attributes to many claimants, a consciousness of the *defects* of their cases. But, were such the fact, are not the Board cloathed with a power to dismiss such cases from the records of their proceedings, and not to suffer other claimants, whose cases require not explanation, or have no defective parts, to linger in fruitless and unprofitable expectations, and irrecoverable time to be uselessly expended, in causeless efforts to repair irretrievable defects? Such cannot be. But, Sir, in the present claims, the term *defects* is solely matter of opinion, and although a conclusive opinion can only be formed by the Board collectively, and by them only, on the impost of defects, yet were defects strictly considered, generally insisted upon; I am of opinion, the whole £600,000 may remain, wrapped up in a napkin, as it is, for ever. In answer to my observations upon the delays that have occurred, I am told much of those delays may be attributed to the claimants own conduct, 'and their knowledge of the defects of their cases.' But, Sir, I must observe, that when claimants are now called upon to produce in the year 1806, or, perhaps, were I to take 1802, I may be more correct, evidence of facts that existed, and then only existed in the knowledge of persons of advanced age, three and twenty years ago, and who are now consigned to their parent earth. And when persons are now called upon to produce an estimate of a security, which a creditor may have taken at the same time, and he is now required to produce the value at that time, for the purpose of ascertaining the intrinsic value of his claim, recoverable only to the amount of what would have been received three and twenty years ago, these are certainly *defects*, I agree with A. B., but they are defects which are not to be remedied in a century, nay, they never can be elucidated. —If, for the elucidation of defects such as these, the Board, in the exercise of their functions, do in the estimation of A. B. intend to wait, the doors of the Board will, I may venture to prophecy, continue open longer than the 140 years I had calculated they would remain unclosed. It may, Sir, have been a perfectly easy matter to have procured an explanation of those circumstances, now termed by A. B. "defects," three and twenty years ago, when the parties able to clear such were alive, and when the value of any property, from the sale of other property similarly situated, and of the like value, might have guided a judgment in forming an estimate; those defects *now* complained of, could not *then* have existed, and I can only consider the term, "defects," to have been brought into view by A. B. without due consideration; nay, I may venture to assert, that to have attempted to prove the then necessary, and in the estimation of A. B. the now requisite facts, would have been attended with superabundant and useless caution. It would have been then said of him, *utitur in re non dubia testibus non necessariis*, and it may be said of him, what I think, he ought not to furnish matter to assist the observation, that he is now endeavouring to obtain proofs, which all the world must know are impossible for him to procure. The penetration, however, of the Board will, I trust, not permit them to exact from us impossibilities; we have, many of us however have had, misery enough without the smallest addition to our sufferings, and whatever our small pittance may be, it is certainly time that we were in possession of it. Thirty years have passed away since the commencement of the American war, and three and twenty years since the peace; but, yet, our claims, certainly, as I have already observed, of greater importance in any point of view than those of the loyalists, are unsatisfied.—The non-payment of them, should not longer remain as it has done, and for ever will be considered, a reproach upon this country, when good faith amongst nations, should be assimilated with good faith towards its own subjects. I hope A. B. has prophecied, beneficially he certainly has, and I shall rejoice to find in the sequel, correctly, when he asserts, that the Board have made greater progress, than I was aware, or apprehend any person believed they had. We have been given to understand, that many of the claims were ripe for decision in 1799, and yet, alas! 7 years have since passed away, and I am now told, when almost all the leading principles of construction were established at Philadelphia 7 years since, that a million of claims in amount has been decided upon, and that other cases to a great amount, are now nearly ripe for adjudication; but, yet, a very large majority of the claimants are totally ignorant of the fact. How can A. B. reconcile his ideas of "publicity," with existing facts? The "publicity," he alludes to, is somewhat similar to a promulgation of the misfortunes of a cornuted man, who is always the third, generally the last person in the house, made acquainted with his wife's

frailty. It would be some satisfaction, if, when a claim was decided, notice of it was published, as are the resolutions of the Board in the Gazette; and the adoption of that rule, would have these benefits, that, the creditors of persons who are claimants on the Board, would be satisfied of the small amount awarded, and that the decisions thus published are correct; and, it might be the means of allaying the prejudices of those persons who expect to receive from the unfortunate claimant a full indemnity for their demands, when he can only receive, as A. B. informs us, two 12 per cents. not on the amount of a creditor's actual claim, but on the sum which may be adjuged to be good, in the estimation of the Board, as well as reconcile A. B's. assertion, that "the Board "have been chiefly occupied in settling "leading points," with another, respecting decisions upon cases of some of the creditors only, viz. that "the Board have nevertheless decided claims to the amount of a "million." And here, I must observe, that although mercantile men, in general, are enabled to form a tolerably correct opinion, of the exact value of debts upon their books, yet, it is impossible to ascertain, what portion of the amount of a creditor's claim will be allowed in the present case; the items of debts, which at the peace were good, and which I might *then* have been able to have proved, had it been deemed necessary, good, and recoverable, but, which, from the intervening deaths of persons enabled to bear testimony at that time, I am now unable to do, may be thrown aside altogether; or, in the best and most favourable point of view, an estimate merely of the value may be made, and in forming such estimate, a general rule of conduct may be adopted, which is applicable perhaps to *particular* cases only, such as the rash facility, with which credit to a great amount was given to all sorts of persons, and the great proportion of bad debts, which in certain lines of trade, was, of course, anticipated. If these assumed matters are adopted *generally*, I trust, however, they are not, much injury must ensue, and there will be little difficulty in deciding upon the remaining claims, nor will much longer time be necessary in disposing of them. I am apprehensive, however, that much time will yet be expended, even according to A. B's. statement; for, if, as he observes, claims to the amount of nearly a million only are decided upon, and this in the space of 4 years, a further term of 16 years may be found requisite for the Board to examine into the remaining claims, before they can be enabled to decide upon them; the probable duration of which, should induce the equity of parliament to be held out for the full relief of creditors, and which the Board, with all their humane inclination, are not empowered to award; for, certain I am, it is a period much beyond the expected probationary existence of a ruined, old,——AMERICAN MERCHANT.——*St. George's Row, August 8, 1806.*

CHARACTER OF PITT.

SIR,—It seems to me a desirable object to refer as much as possible of our national proceedings for some years past, to the influence of the late minister's character on the public feelings, and to the blind confidence generally placed in his talents and integrity. The errors that we have been led into by a confidence of this sort, will be sooner retrieved than if they proceeded from a change in our own habits and dispositions. It is well if we can save the credit of our moral character a little, at the expense of our understandings; for, I cannot think that our confidence was well bestowed. I know, it is a general maxim, that we are not to war with the dead: we ought not indeed to trample on their bodies, but with their *minds* we may, and must war, unless we would be governed by them after they are dead. They who wish their sentiments to survive them in the memories of men, must also expect to live in their censures. The character of Mr. Pitt was perhaps one of the most singular that ever existed. With few talents and fewer virtues he acquired and preserved in one of the most trying situations and in spite of all opposition the highest reputation for the possession of every moral excellence, and as having carried the attainments of eloquence and wisdom as far as human abilities could go. This he did (strange as it appears) by a negation, (together with the common virtues) of the common vices of human nature, and by the complete negation of every other talent that might interfere with the only one which he possessed in a supreme degree, and which, indeed, may be made to conceal the want of all others, an artful use of words, and a certain dexterity of logical arrangement. In these alone his power consisted, and the defect of all other qualities, which usually constitute greatness, contributed to the more complete success of these.——Having no strong feelings, no distinct perceptions, his mind having no link as it were to connect it with the world of external nature, every subject presented to him nothing more than a *tabula rasa* on which he was at liberty to

lay whatever colouring of language he pleased; having no general principles, no comprehensive views of things, no moral habits of thinking, no system of action; there was nothing to hinder him from pursuing any particular purpose by any means that offered; having never any plan, he could not be convicted of inconsistency, and his own pride and obstinacy were the only rules of his conduct. Having no insight into human nature, no sympathy with the passions of men, or apprehension of their real designs, he seemed perfectly insensible to the consequences of things, and would believe nothing, till it actually happened. The fog and haze in which he saw every thing, communicated itself to others; and the total indistinctness and uncertainty of his own ideas tended to confound the perceptions of his hearers, more effectually than the most ingenious misrepresentation could have done. Indeed, in defending his conduct he never seemed to consider himself as at all responsible for the success of his measures, or that future events were in our own power; but, that as the best laid schemes might fail, and there was no providing against all possible contingencies; this was a sufficient excuse for our plunging at once into any dangerous or absurd enterprize, without the least regard to consequences. His reserved logic confined itself solely to the *possible* and the *impossible*, and he appeared to regard the *probable* and *improbable*, the only foundation of moral prudence, or political wisdom, as beneath the notice of a profound statesman; as if the pride of the human intellect were concerned in never entrusting itself with subjects where it may be compelled to acknowledge its weakness. From his manner of reasoning, he seemed not to have believed that the truth of his statements depended on the reality of the facts, but that the things themselves depended on the order in which he arranged them in words; you would not suppose him to be agitating a serious question, which had real grounds to go upon, but to be declaiming upon an imaginary thesis proposed as an exercise in the schools. He never set himself to examine the force of the objections that were brought against his measures, or attempted to establish them upon clear, solid grounds of his own, but constantly contented himself with first gravely stating the logical form or dilemma, to which the question reduced itself, and then after having declared his opinion, proceeded to amuse his hearers by a series of rhetorical common places, connected together in grave, sonorous, and elaborately constructed periods, without ever shewing their real application to the subject in dispute. Thus, if any member of the opposition disapproved of any measure, and enforced his objections by pointing out the many evils with which it was fraught, or the difficulties attending its execution, his only answer was, that it was true, there might be inconveniencies attending the measure proposed; but we were to remember that every expedient that could be devised, might be said to be nothing more than a choice of difficulties, and that all human prudence could do, was to consider on which side the advantages lay; that for his part he conceived, that the present measure was attended with more advantages, and fewer disadvantages than any other that could be adopted, that if we were diverted from our object by every appearance of difficulty, the wheels of government would be clogged by endless delays, and imaginary grievances, that most of the objections made to the measure, appeared to him to be trivial, others of them unfounded and improbable; or, that if a scheme free from all these objections could be proposed, it might, after all, prove inefficient, while, in the mean time, a material object remained unprovided for, or the opportunity of action was lost. This mode of reasoning is admirably described by Hobbes in speaking of the writings of some of the schoolmen; of whom, he says, that "they "had learned the trick of imposing what "they list upon their readers, and declining "the force of true reason by verbal forks, "these are distinctions which signify no-"thing, but serve only to astonish the mul-"titude of ignorant men." That what I have here stated comprehends the whole force of his mind, which consisted solely in this evasive dexterity, and perplexing formality, assisted by a copiousness of words, and common-place topics; will, I think, be evident to any one who carefully looks over his speeches, undazzled by the reputation or personal influence of the speaker. It will be in vain to look in them for any of the common proofs of human genius or wisdom. He has not left behind him a single memorable saying, not one profound maxim, one solid observation, one forcible description, one beautiful thought, one lively allusion, one humourous picture, one affecting sentiment. He has made no addition whatever to the stock of human knowledge. He did not possess any one of those faculties which contribute to the instruction and delight of mankind, depth of understanding, imagination, sensibility, wit, vivacity, clear

and solid judgment. —— His reasoning is a technical arrangement of unmeaning common-places, his eloquence merely rhetorical, his style monotonous and artificial. If he could pretend to any one excellence in an eminent degree, it was to taste in composition. There is certainly nothing low, nothing puerile, nothing farfetched, or abrupt, in his speeches, there is a kind of faultless regularity pervading them throughout; but in the confined, mechanical, passive, mode of eloquence which he adopted, it seemed rather more difficult to commit errors than to avoid them. A man who is determined never to move out of the beaten road cannot lose his way. However habit joined to the peculiar mechanical memory which he possessed carried this correctness to a degree which in an extemporaneous speaker was almost miraculous: he, perhaps, hardly ever uttered a sentence that was not perfectly regular and connected. In this respect, he not only had the advantage over his own contemporaries, but perhaps no one that ever lived equalled him in this singular faculty. But for this, he would always have passed for a common man; and to this the constant sameness, and, if I may so say, vulgarity of his ideas, must have contributed not a little, as there was nothing to distract his mind from this one object of his unintermitted attention, and as, even in his choice of words, he never aimed at any thing more than a certain general propriety and stately uniformity of style.—His talents were exactly fitted for the situation in which he was placed, where it was his business not to overcome others, but to avoid being overcome. He was able to baffle opposition, not from strength or firmness, but from the evasive ambiguity and impalpable nature of his resistance, which gave no hold to the rude grasp of his opponents; no force *could bind the loose phantom, and his mind (though "not "matchless and his pride humbled by such "rebuke") soon rose from defeat unhurt,*

"And in its liquid texture mortal wound
"Receiv'd no more than can the fluid air."

By this lucky combination of strength and weakness, he succeeded in maintaining an undiminished influence over the opinions of his own country for a number of years, in wielding her energies as he pleased, and guiding the counsels of almost all Europe.—VERAX.

PUBLIC PAPERS.

FRANCE AND BAVARIA.—*Treaty concluded between the Emperor of the French and King of Italy, and the King of Bavaria, relative to the Military Line to be drawn in a Part of the Tyrol contiguous to the Kingdom of Italy.—Signed at Munich, May 25, 1806.*

His Majesty the Emperor of the French and King of Italy, and his Majesty the King of Bavaria, wishing to settle the military line which shall be established in Italian Tyrol, have resolved to proceed to the settling of this arrangment, and have therefore named the following plenipotentiaries, viz. Marshal Berthier, on the part of his Majesty the Emperor of the French, and M. De Montzelas, on that of the King of Bavaria, who having exchanged their respective powers, have agreed upon the following articles:—Art. 1. His Majesty the King of Bavaria engages, as well for himself as his successors, never to construct any fortifications, nor to form any magazine of war, or any cordon of troops, in the whole division of Italian Tyrol, situated to the South, and comprised between the military line to be laid down in Art 2, and the frontier of the kingdom of Italy. His Majesty engages also not to occupy, in a military manner, the line and the countries of which the names are contained in the 2d Art.—Art. 2. The military line agreed upon in Art. 1. will commence from Roveredo, and will follow to the east the left bank of the Adige, ascending that river as far as Matarello. It will pass on to Valsorda, Vigolo, Bosentino, Calcranico, Caldonazzo, and by the road of Levico as far as that town; from hence it will follow to the east the valley of the Brenta, passing by St. Desiderio, Marter, Montebello, Borgo di Valsuguna, Castel Nuovo, Griguo, Belven, Tezze, to the frontier of the kingdom of Italy. To the west, the line leaving Roveredo, will stretch on to Sacchio, and cross the Adige; it will pass by Isera, Folas, Connolice, Mount Stiva, St. Giacomo, and Arco; from this last town it will descend the torrent Sarca, as far as Chiaran and St Pietro, following the limits of the territory of Termo. Passing from thence to Balin, it will follow the limits of the valley of Ledro, and the heights of Dro, falling down the torrent as far as Bondo; descending the stream of the Arno, by Breju and Tion till the junction of the Arno with the Sarca; it will descend this last river, passing by Dare, Vigo, Bocenago, Giustin, Vadojou, Baldin, St. Vigilio; it will follow the path of Mavignola, the road and the stream which conduct to St. Maria di Campiglio, to Campo, and Mount Campei; then descending the stream Meledrio, it will stretch itself by St. Brigida and Dimaro, as far as the junction

of that stream with that of Noce; it will ascend this last, passing by Ravina, Martellina, Pillizano, and Curiano, as far as the junction of that stream with the Pei; and descending that stream, it will pass by Callentino, Calladizza, Cagolo, Pejo; from thence ascending the stream of the Noce or Nanno, it will extend to the mountain Del Corno, which forms the boundary between Italy, Switzerland, and the Tyrol, in such a way that the mountain Tonale shall be comprised among the points which cannot be fortified, entrenched, or occupied, as a military position.—Art. 3. No fortification or entrenchment shall be constructed on the military line marked out by the foregoing article, nor at the distance of 500 toises to the north of that line, that is, on the side of German Tyrol.—Art. 4. The reservation of a part of Italian Tyrol, in favor of the kingdom of Italy, mentioned in the first article of the *procès verbal* of the surrender of the Tyrol to his Majesty the King of Bavaria, being annulled by the present treaty, his said Majesty will immediately take possession of the above-mentioned portion of Italian Tyrol, to enjoy it, he, his heirs, and successors, in full and entire sovereignty, saving the exceptions made in the 1st, 2d, and 3d, articles.—Art. 5. The ratifications of the present treaty shall be exchanged in the course of 12 days, or sooner, if it can be done.

CONFEDERATION OF THE RHINE.—*Act of Confederation of the Rhenish League, Done at Paris, July* 12, 1806.

Whereas his Majesty the Emperor of the French, and their Majesties the Kings of Bavaria and Wirtenberg; their Electoral Highnesses the Arch-Chancellor and the Elector of Baden; his imperial highness the Duke of Berg; and their royal highnesses the Landgrave of Hesse Darmstadt, the Princes of Nassau-Weilburg and Nassau-Usingen, of Hohenzollern-Hechingen, and Hohenzollern-Siegmaringen, Salm-Salm, and Salm-Kyrburg, Isenburg Birstein, and Lichtenstein; the Duke of Ahremberg, and the Count of Leyin; being desirous to secure, through proper stipulations, the internal and external peace of Southern Germany, which, as experience for a long period and recently has shewn, can derive no kind of guarantee from the existing German constitution; have appointed to be their Plenipotentiaries to this effect, namely, His Majesty the Emperor of the French, Charles Maurice Talleyrand, Duke of Benevento, minister of his foreign affairs; his Majesty the King of Bavaria, his minister plenipotentiary, A. Von Cetto; his Majesty the King of Wirtemberg, his state minister the count of Wintzingerode; the Elector Arch-Chancellor, his ambassador extraordinary, the count of Boust; the Elector of Baden, his cabinet minister the Baron of Reitzenstein; his imperial highness the Duke of Berg, Baron Von Schele; the Landgrave of Hesse Darmstadt, his ambassador extraordinary, Baron Von Pappenheim; the Princes of Nassau-Weilburg, and Usingen, Baron Von Gagern; the Princes of Hohenzollern-Hechingen, and Siegmaringen, Major Von Fischer; the Prince of Isenburg, Birstein, his privy councillor, M. Von Grentzen; the Duke of Ahremberg, and the count of Leyen, Mr. Durand St. André; who have agreed upon the following articles.—Art. 1. The states of the contracting Princes (enumerated as in the Preamble), shall be forever separated from the Germanic body, and united, by a particular confederation under the designation of the Confederated States of the Empire."—Art. II. All the laws of the empire, by which they have been hitherto bound, shall be in future null and without force, with the exception of the statutes relative to debts determined in the recess of the deputation of 1803, and in the paragraph upon the navigation, to be funded upon the shipping tolls, which statutes shall remain in full vigour and execution.—Art. III. Each of the contracting princes renounces such of his titles as refer to his connection with the German Empire, and they will on the first of Aug. declare their entire separation from it. Art. IV. The Elector Arch Chancellor shall take the title of Prince Primate and most Eminent Higness (given in French, Altesse Eminentissime) which title shall convey no prerogative derogatoay to the entire sovereignty which every one of the contracting Princes shall enjoy.—Art. V. The Elector of Baden, the Dnke of Berg, and the Landgrave of Hesse Darmstadt shall take the title of Grand Dukes, and enjoy the rights, honours, and prerogatives belonging to the kingly dignity. Their rank and precedence shall be in the same order as they are mentioned in Art. I. The chief of the Houses of Nassau shall take the title of Duke, and the Count of Leyen that of Prince.—Art. VI. The affairs of the confederation shall be discussed in a congress of the Union (Diète) whose place of sitting shall be in Frankfort, and the congress shall be divided into two colleges, the kings and the princes.—Art. VII. The members of the league must be independent of every foreign power. They cannot in any wise enter into any other service, but that of the states of the confede-

ration and its allies. Those who have been hitherto in the service of a foreign power, and chuse to adhere to it, shall abdicate their principality in favour of one of their children.—Art. VIII. Should any of the said princes be disposed to alienate the whole or any part of his sovereignty, he can only do it in favour of the confederates.—Art. IX. All disputes which may arise among the members of the league shall be settled in the assembly at Francfort. Art. X. In this the Prince Primate shall preside, and when it shall happen that the two colleges have to deliberate upon any subject, he shall then preside in the college of kings, and the Duke of Nassau in that of the princes.—Art. XI. The time when the congress of the league, or either of the colleges, shall have particularly to assemble, the manner of the convocation, the subjects upon which they may have to deliberate, the manner of forming their conclusions, and putting them in execution, shall be determined in a fundamental statute, which the Prince Primate shall give in proposition, within a month after the notification presented at Ratisbon. This statute shall be approved of by the confederated states; this statute shall also regulate the respective rank of the members of the college of princes.—Art. XII. The Emperor shall be proclaimed protector of the confederation. On the demise of the Primate he shall, in such quality, as often name the successor.—Art. XIII. His Majesty, the King of Bavaria, cedes to the King of Wirtemberg, the Lordship of Wiesensteig, and renounces the rights which he might have upon Weiblingen, on account of Burgau.—Art. XIV. His Majesty, the King of Wirtemberg, makes over to the Grand Duke of Berg, the county of Bonndorff, Breunlingen, and Villingen, the part of the territory of the latter city, which lies on the right bank of the Brigoetz, and the city of Tuttlingen, with the manor of the same name belonging to it on the right baad of the Danube.—Art. XV. The Grand Duke of Baden cedes to the King of Wirtemberg the city and territory of Biebrach, with their dependancies.—Art. XVI. The Duke of Nassau cedes to the Grand Duke of Berg the city of Deutz and its territory.—Art. XVII. His Majesty the King of Bavaria shall unite to his states the city and territory of Nuremberg, and the Teutonic comitials of Rohr and Waldstetten.—Art. XVIII. His Majesty the King of Wirtemberg shall receive the lordship of Wiesensteig the city and territory of Bleberach, with their dependencies, the cities of Waldsee and Schettingen, the comitial lands of Karpfenburg, Laucheim and Alschhausen, with the exception of the lordship of Hohenfeld and the abbey of Weiblingen.—Art. XIX. The Grand Duke of Baden shall receive the lordship of Bonndorff, the cities of Vreulingen, Villingen, and Tuttlingen, the parts of their territories which are given to him in Art. XIV. and along with these the comitials of Bolken and Freyburg.—Art. XX. The Grand Duke of Berg shall receive the city and territory of Deutz, the city and manor of Koeningswinter and the manor of Wistich as ceded by the Duke of Nassau.—Art. XXI. The Grand of Darmstadt shall unite to his states the burgraviat of Friedberg, taking to himself the sovereignty only during the lifetime of the present possessor, and the whole at his death.—Art. XXII. The Prince Primate shall take possession of the city of Frankfort on the Maine and its territory, as his sovereign property.—Art. XXIII. The Prince of Hollenzollern Siegmaringen shall receive as his sovereign property the lordships of Aschberg and Hohensels depending on the comitial of Aschhausen, the convents of Klosterwald and Haltzthal, and the sovereignty over the imperial equestrian estates that lie in his dominions, and in the territory to the north of the Danube, wherever his sovereignty extends, namely, the lordships of Gamerdingen and Hottingen.—Art. XXIV. The members of the confederation shall exercise all the rights of sovereiguty henceforward as follow:—His Majesty the King of Bavaria, over the principality of Schwartzenberg, the county of Castell, the lordships of Speinfeld and Wiesenheid, the dependencies of the principality of Hohenlohe, which are included in the margraviate of Anspach, and the territory of Rothanburg, namely, the great manors of Schillingsfurst and Kirchberg, the county of Sternstein, the principality of Oettingen, the possessions of the Prince of La Tour to the north of the principality of Neuburg,, the county of Edelstetten, the possessions of the Prince and of the Count of Fugger, the burgraviat of Winterrieden; lastly, the lordships of Buxheim and Tannhausen, and over the entire of the higway from Memmingen to Lindau.—His Majesty the King of Wirtemberg, over the possessions of the Prince and Count of Truchess Waldburg, the counties of Baindt, Egloff Guttenzell, Hechbach, Ysuy, Koenigseek Aulendorff, Ochsenhausen,, Roth, Schussenried, and Weissenau the lordships of Mietingen and Sunningen, New Ravensburg Thannheim, Warthausen, and Weingarten, with exception of the lordship of Hagenau; the possessions of the Prince of Thurn, with the exception of those not mentioned above; the lordship of Strass-

berg and manor of Oztraitz, the lordship of Gundelsingen which his Majesty does not possess, all the unalineated possessions of the Princess of Hohenlohe, and over a part of the manor formerly belonging to Mentz, Krautheim on the left bank of the Jaxt.—The Grand Duke of Baden over the Principality of Feurstenberg (with the exception of the lordships of Gundelsingen and Neussen); also over Trochtelfingen, Jungenau, and the part of the Manor of Moeskirch, which lies on the left bank of the Danube, over the lordship of Hagenau, county of Thuengen, Landgraviat Klettgau, manors Neidenau and Billigheim, principality of Liningen, the possessions of Lowenstein Wertheim, upon the left bank of the Maine (with the exception of the County of Loewenstein), and the lordships of Aaibach, Brennberg, and Habitzheim; and lastly over the possessions of the Princes of Salm-Reiferscheid-Krautheim, to the North of the Jaxt.—The Grand Duke of Berg, over the Lordships of Limburg Styrum, Brugg, Hardenberg, Gimborn, and Neustadt, Wildenberg; the counties of Homburg, Bentheim, Steinfort, and Horstmarn, the possessions of the Duke of Looz, the counties of Siegen, Dillenburg (the Manors of Werheim and Burgoch excepted), over Stadamar, the Lordships Westerburg, Schadeck, and Beilstein, and, the properly so called, part of Runkelt on the right bank of the Lahn. In order to establish a communication between Cleves and the above-named possessions, the Grand Duke shall have a free passage through the States of the Prince of Salm.—His Highness the Grand Duke of Darmstadt, over the Lordships of Brenberg, Haibach; the manor of Habizheim, County of Erbach, Lordship of Illenstadt, a part of the County of Konigsheim, which is possessed by the Prince of Stolberb Gedern; over the possessions of the Baron of Redesel, that are included in, or lie contiguous to, his States, namely, the jurisdictions of Lauserhach, Stockhausen, Mort, and Truenstern, the possessions of the Princes and Counts of Solms, in Wetterau, exclusive of the Manors of Hohen-Solms, Braunsels, and Greifensten; lastly, the Counties Wittgenstein and Berleburg, and the Manor of Hessen-Homburg, which is in possession of the line of that names—His most serene eminence (Durchlauchtige Eminez) the Prince Primate, over the possessions of the princes and counts of Lowenstein-Wertheim, on the right bank of the Maine, and over the county of Rheineck.—Nassau Usingen, and Nassau Weilburg, over the Manors of Diersdorf, Altenwied, Neursburgh, and the part of the county of Bassenburgh, which belongs to the prince of Wied Runkel, over the counties of Nonwied and Holzapfel, the lordship of Schomburg, the county of Diez and its dependencies, over that part of the village of Metzfelden, which appertains to the prince of Nassau Fulda, the Manors of Werheim and Balbach, that part of the lordship of Runkel, situate on the left bank of the Dalur, over the equestrian possessions of Kransberg, and, lastly, over the manors of Solms Braunfels, Hohen Solms, and Greifenstein.—The Prince of Hohenzollern-Siegmaringen over Trochtelfingen, Jungenau, Strasberg, manor Ostrach, and the part of the lordship of Moeskirch which lays on the left bank of the Danube.—Salm Kyrburg over the lordship of Genmen.—Isenburg-Burstein, over the possessions of the Count of Isenburgh Budingen, Wechtersbach, and Mehrholz, without any pretensions on the part of the branch in present possession being urged against him.—Ahremberg over the county of Dulmen.—Art. XXV. The members of the confederation shall take the sovereignty of the Imperial equestrian lands included within their boundaries. Such of these lands as lie between the States of two of the Confederates, shall be with respect to the sovereignty partitioned as exactly as possible between them, that no misunderstanding with respect to the sovereignty may arise.

To be Continued.

Letter from Champagny, French Minister of the Interior, to Marshall Kellerman. Dated July 21, 1806.

Sir;—In conformity to your desire, I have informed his Majesty of the monument which the Society, of which you are a member, designed to erect to him. The Emperor was touched with this proof of the attachment of a number of estimable Citizens, among whom he has with pleasure seen you, Sir, who are equally distinguished by your rank, and the services which you have rendered. But the principles of his Majesty do not permit him to accept an offer of this sort, though dictated by a sentiment, as free as pure, of love, admiration, and gratitude. This homage of his subjects, the Emperor wishes to merit by his whole life. He will never consent, therefore, that during his life-time, monuments shall be erected to him by individuals. It is from posterity, that he awaits this honourable recompense his Majesty the King of Bavaria.—Baron Von Seckendorf, Minister of State, and heretofore Ambassador to the Diet of his Majesty the King of Wirtemberg.—Baron Von Albini, Minister of State and Directorial Ambassador of the Electoral Arch-chan-

of so many labours. After his death, the French may acknowledge, by an homage, the design of which cannot be disputed, the good which he shall have done to the nation which he governs, and whose prosperity and glory, the constant objects of his meditations and his watchings, are also the only objects of the ambition of his whole life.—In transmitting to you these wishes of his Majesty, which I entreat you to communicate to your fellow-subscribers, I join, Sir, my regret to your's, on a decision so contrary to our wishes, and I beg you to accept the assurance of my high consideration.—(Signed) CHAMPAGNY.—N. B. A similar determination has been adopted relative to the project of a pillar, formed by M. Poyet, the Architect, and for which a great number of considerable subscriptions had already been made. This has been notified to the subscribers by the Minister of the Interior.

Declaration delivered in to the Diet of Ratisbon, by the Elector Arch-Chancellor:—Dated Ratisbon, August 1, 1806.

Right worthy, noble, and high esteemed, Sirs,—The underwritten deputies and ambassadors to the general Diet of the German empire, have received orders to communicate the annexed declaration, in the names of their respective sovereigns, to your excellencies.—The occurrences of the three last wars, which have almost uninterruptedly disturbed the tranquillity of Germany, and the political changes resulting from them, have most fully demonstrated that the bonds which were hitherto intended to unite the different members of the Germanic body, were inadequate to the purpose, or rather, that they were already actually dissolved. The cause of this truth has long existed in the heart of every German, and however painful the experience of late years has been, it has, in fact, only proved the decay of a constitution, venerable in its origin, but which had become faulty in consequence of the imperfections inseparable from all human institutions. To this circumstance alone, must, undoubtedly, be ascribed, the division which took place in the empire in 1795, and produced a separation of the interests of Northern and Southern Germany. From this moment, all ideas of one common country and interest must have vanished: the expressions, war of the empire, and peace of the empire, became words without signification; and in the midst of the German imperial body, Germany was sought in vain. The princes contiguous to France, destitute of all protection, exposed to all the terrors of a war which they had no constitutional means of terminating, were in fact, obliged to secede by separate treaties from the general union. The peace of Luneville, and still more the decrees of the empire of 1803, certainly seemed sufficient to give new vigour to the Germanic constitution, as they removed the weak parts of the system, and strengthened the principal pillars by which it was supported. —But the events that took place in the last ten months in the face of the whole empire, have blasted this last hope, and placed anew, out of all doubt, the inadequacy of the constitution hitherto subsisting. By these important considerations, the sovereigns and princes of the south and west of Germany have been induced to form a new confederacy adapted to the circumstances of the times. While they renounce by this declaration their connection with the Germanic body, they merely follow the system set up by former precedents, and by the declarations of the more powerful states of the empire. They might, indeed, have retained the empty shadow of an extinguished constitution; but they have, on the contrary, thought it more consonant to their dignity, and the purity of their intentions, to make a voluntary and public declaration of their resolution, and the motives by which they have been instigated.—In vain, would they have flattered themselves with the hope of attaining the desired object, had they not been assured of a powerful protection, in the person of that monarch, whose views have always manifested their coincidence with the real interests of Germany. Such a powerful guarantee is doubly satisfactory. It affords the assurance, that his Majesty, the Emperor of France, not only for the sake of his own glory, but likewise for the particular interest of the French empire, will feel a solicitude in the maintenance of the new order of things in Germany, and the promotion of internal and external tranquillity. That this precious tranquillity is the principal object of the Rhenish confederacy must be obvious to the former imperial co-estates of those sovereigns in whose name the declaration is made, from the circumstance, that every one of them, whose situation might render him desirous to participate in it, is at liberty to accede to it.—At the same time that we hereby discharge this high and important duty, we have the honour to subjoin the assurance of the most respectful devotion with which we are Your Excellency's most obedient, &c.—(Signed) Baron Von REICHBERG, Privy Counsellor, and heretofore Ambassador to the Diet of

cellor.—Albert Baron Von SECKLENDORF, Ambassador of the Elector of Baden.—Baron Von TURKHEIM, Ambassador of the Landgrave of Hesse.—Edmund Baron Von SCHMITZ-GROLLENBURG, Ambassador of his Serene Highness the Prince of Hohenzollern-Hechingen, and of the whole princely House of Hohenzollern.—Von WOLF, Vicar-General and Dean, as Ambassador of the Prince of Salm-Kyrburg.—Von MOLLENBEC, on the part of his Serene Highness the Prince of Isenburg.

BUONAPARTÉ AND THE JEWS.——*Proceedings of the Assembly of French Deputies professing the Religion of the Jews. Second Sitting. From the Moniteur, Paris, August* 4, 1806.

The commissioners of his Majesty having entered the hall, M. Mole, who was at their head, addressed the assembly as follows:

Gentlemen,——His Majesty the Emperor and King having appointed us commissioners to treat with you, respecting your own affairs, has sent us here this day for the purpose of communicating his intentions. Called from the farthest part of this vast empire, none of you can be ignorant of the purposes for which you are assembled here. You are aware that the conduct of many of those who profess your religion, has given rise to complaints which have reached the foot of the throne. These complaints were not without foundation. The Emperor, notwithstanding, contented himself with arresting the progress of the evil, and wished to have your opinion on the means of radically curing it. You will, no doubt, prove yourselves deserving of this paternal consideration, and you will feel the value of the important mission which is confided to you. Far from regarding the government under which you live, as a power of which you should be suspicious, your study will be to enlighten it, to co-operate with it in the good which it is preparing; and by thus manifesting that you have profited by the experience of all the French, you will prove, that you have no wish to separate yourselves from other classes of society.——The laws which have been imposed upon persons of your religion have been different all over the world; they have been too often dictated by the exigency of the moment. But, as there is no example in the Christian Annals of any assembly like this, so, in like manner, you, for the first time, are to be impartially judged, and your fate decided by a Christian Prince. It is his Majesty's wish that you should become French; it is your duty to accept this title, and to consider that you, in fact, renounce it, whenever you shew yourselves unworthy of it.—You shall hear the questions read, which are to be proposed to you. It will be your duty to declare the whole truth upon each of them. We now declare to you, and we shall never cease to repeat it to you, that when a Sovereign, as firm as he is just, who knows every thing, who can punish as well as reward, interrogates his subjects, they would render themselves as culpable as they would shew themselves blind to their real interests, if they should hesitate about answering freely and frankly.——It is his Majesty's wish, gentlemen, that you should enjoy perfect freedom of deliberation. Your president will communicate your answers to us as soon as they are prepared. As to ourselves, we have no more ardent wishes than to be able to inform the Emperor, that among his subjects of the Jewish religion, there are none whose loyalty is not unquestionable, and who are not disposed to conform to those laws and morals which it is the duty of all Frenchmen to practise and follow."

The following questions proposed by his Majesty, were then read by the secretary of the meeting:—1. Is the Jew permitted to marry more than one wife?—2. Is divorce permitted by the Jewish religion?—3. Can a Jewess intermarry with a Christian, or a Christian female with a Jew? or does the law prescribe that Jews alone should intermarry?—4. Are the French in the eyes of the Jews brothers or aliens?—5. What, in all cases, are the connections which their law permits them to maintain with the French who are not of their religion?—6. Do the Jews who were born in France, and have been treated as French citizens by the laws, consider France as their native country? Are they bound to defend it? Are they under an obligation to obey the laws, and to follow all the regulations of the civil code?—7. Who are they who are called Rabbins?—8. What civil jurisdiction do the Rabbins exercise among the Jews? What power of punishment do they possess?—9. Are the mode of chusing the Rabbins, and the system of punishment, regulated by the Jewish laws, or are they only rendered sacred by custom?—10. Were the Jews forbidden by their laws to take usury of their brethren? Are they permitted or forbidden to do this of strangers?—11. Are those things proclaimed, which are forbidden to the Jews by their law?"

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Bow Street, Covent Garden where former Numbers maybe had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall.